

THE
METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JULY, 1864.

ART. I.—JOHN DEMPSTER, D.D.

CHARACTERS of exalted Christian and intellectual worth, possessing withal distinctive and original traits, constitute an impressive heritage of the Church and the world. The order of events with which they have been connected, and which under divine guidance they have assisted to modify, is of historic value chiefly in proportion as the personal instruments it involves are brought into public view. This is a sufficient reason for putting into permanent record every important reminiscence of men who have made themselves noble examples of public usefulness. They have lived to a good—often to a grand—purpose; and whatever excellence in their spirit and method of life can stimulate and energize others, is the rightful property of those who come later on the stage. It is true of *all* men that “no man liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself;” and in certain distinctive cases this may be asserted with great emphasis.

The character of him who is the subject of the present memoir had a rare native basis, and was formed by a unique discipline. From the features natural to it, it would have been a marked character whatever impulses had given it direction. It would have given forth a torrent of evil influences had it been formed and swayed by motives wholly worldly and wicked. But early yielding to divine grace, it saved the world from such a disaster; and the heritage we possess in it from the

FOURTH SERIES, VOL. XVI.—23

strikingly useful course it did take in its career of indefatigable service for the cause of God, is that for which the Church will have cause for gratitude during years and ages to come.

We could not, even in the fullest biographical outline, do the character of our subject perfect justice. Its depth, intensity, and richness were doubtless not realizable nor open even to his own view. For this reason, and for want of materials, save such as by much painstaking are gathered from acquaintances and personal friends in recollected events respecting him, we can present but an outline the most meager. No private journal nor correspondence is possible to be drawn upon; printed documents or references touching his career are few; family friends, from whom to obtain interesting minutiae, are scattered far and wide; and we are left to a large dependence on our own professional acquaintance and observations, continued through more than seven years of brotherly fellowship and labor, to work out as just an exhibit, as is possible under such circumstances, of a mind which, under most unpropitious early privileges, wrought for itself acquisitions and an available mental force scarcely to be hoped for by ordinary men in this mortal world of ours. He also conceived and executed for the Methodist Episcopal Church a plan of ministerial education which, though some time held at bay, has now from its fruits the general sanction of nearly all classes of men in the Church. A better and fuller record of such a man, it is hoped, will in due time be forthcoming.

John Dempster was born in Florida, Montgomery (since divided and now Fulton) County, New York, on the second day of January, 1794, and thus was at his death but a few weeks less than seventy years of age. His father, the Rev. James Dempster, was a Scotchman, educated at the University of Edinburgh, and, though bred a Presbyterian, was received by Mr. Wesley as one of his collaborators, and sent by him as a missionary to America. He preached for a season in the city of New York, but for some reason became disconnected from Mr. Wesley's service, and was thereafter a pastor of a Presbyterian Church in the town of Florida till his death, in 1803. He was a man of learning, talents, and piety, and was very much revered by his flock and in all circles in which he moved. He was twice married. By the first marriage he had

no surviving children; by the second he had four, of which the subject of this notice was the second son. The father's faithful training in books was bestowed on his children as long as he was permitted to live; but John was too young to have received much attention in this respect, and after his father's death he was too restless and romantic to have interest in learning either at home or at school. He grew up ignorant of books, barely eking out a sufficiency of penmanship and arithmetic to serve him at the tin-trading business, in which he early engaged. The details of the manner of his childhood and early youth have no interest other than that they show him eccentric and thoughtless at that period; these traits foreboding for him anything but a hopeful future. All experiments on him failed to bring out any appearance of a steady, unwavering purpose of life till, as a venture, he was sent on a peddling excursion for his elder brother, who was engaged in tin-ware manufacture. He continued in these excursions till the period of his conversion to God, at a camp-meeting, when he was eighteen years of age.

The revolution in him was wonderfully complete. Purposes, tastes, plans, *all* assumed the rarest change of character. To repair his sadly neglected education he sought such aids as he could command; but chiefly by himself alone he undertook this work on a system of husbanding time and other resources, which system he kept all his after life with strenuous invariableness. For over fifty years it was his habit to retire at nine at night and to rise at four in the morning. The hours of the day were sacredly assigned to specific duties, the most of these duties consisting of intense study. He began with elementary English study, embracing English grammar and arithmetic, and a range of useful reading.

His moral and spiritual life also took at once most interesting phases. His zeal was of the intensest kind; his love for impenitent souls was a burning fire within him; and he stopped at no obstacles nor sacrifices to exhort men, far and near, to "flee from the wrath to come." He began early to show unusual power as a speaker, and marked natural acuteness as a thinker. His early career was at a period when religion, in the form in which he and the Church to which he had attached himself professed it, was scornfully reviled, and the doctrines

underlying it caricatured. All around him it was taught in the rankest manner, on the one hand, that all men were to be unconditionally saved, and, on the other, that none but the unconditionally *elect* could be saved. And he was forced, in self-defense, and in defense of what he deemed most sacred truth, to be a combatant. He advanced at once most easily into the habit of a practical logician. He was compelled to study intently the relations of thought as they existed in those subjects which he was shut up to in his early preaching, and as they were revealed to him in the light of a glowing imagination, which was a distinguishing feature in his mental composition. Without rules, without instruction in the art, except what came from his own self-drill, he became a dialectician. His habits of study, stern, simple, and narrow, kept him all his life in this one groove; he thought and spoke in syllogisms, the major premise being perhaps suppressed, though this was scarcely ever out of view.

To the aid of these processes he made all his studies bend. After the first elements in English came the philosophy of Stuart and Brown, and the ethics of Butler; then the ancient languages; next, calculations in algebra; after these things, or along with these, biblical science and natural science, and every thing kindred to a theological curriculum. Outstripping the most of his peers in these things, he became an oracle to them and to those of younger years immediately succeeding, until the days of broader, deeper, and more critical learning came from the establishment of schools and colleges. Even then, and to his last day, he could bow to no superior among them in dialectic skill.

These were the main characteristics of his inner intellectual life at this period. In 1816, four years from the period of his conversion, his regular conference ministry commenced, and this date was perhaps the beginning of the more systematic severity of his self-imposed tasks in study, which were not remitted till the day that he submitted to the fatal surgical operation. The result of such habits was a conscious intellectual growth as long as he lived. The result declared itself early in his continually rising power in the pulpit. Tradition says, that from early time his sermons were commenced with their propositions clearly laid out, then proceeded in calm, often stately,

logic till the peroration was reached, when the conclusion would be clinched on the conscience, and the refuge of lies would be swept away, guilt would be uncovered, and appeals of startling unction and fearful power would close the scene, to the utter dismay of the daring disbeliever. An affluent imagination flashed light and a rich glow over his sermons in those years, and gave great attractiveness to him as a preacher. In later times his performances became more sobered, more polished, and retrenched of words, more compactly logical; but then even the fire would for a moment at a time occasionally stream out at the joints.

We have sought by correspondence, but have failed to obtain any important incidents connected with his early ministry which could give special interest to a chronological notice. We are compelled therefore to present less of details of his life and labors than is desirable, and to confine ourselves to general views of his character and of the work which he has done for the Church. But such incidents and such references to records and minutes as have transpired show him to have begun to preach three months after his conversion, and to have continued to preach, more or less, under the presiding elder, the Rev. Charles Giles, now surviving, till his admission into the Genesee Conference, in 1816. Owing to very doubtful health, he was continued a probationer in conference four years. His first field of labor was the St. Lawrence Circuit, Lower Canada District. The Rev. George Peck, D.D., who is now the only surviving member of the class of thirteen with which Dempster was admitted, says of him that "his first circuit was a vast field, most of it a wilderness. During the cold season his horse broke down, and he went to his appointments on foot. His boots gave out, but he went on still, his feet constantly wet with snow-water; nothing daunted, he must meet his appointments. His soul blazed, while his poor body shivered and withered under hardships too terrible for humanity to endure. It is not surprising that the next conference found him in a broken down condition. His next appointment was to Paris, an important station, though one which required little but Sabbath labor. The appointment was regarded by some of the old preachers as a doubtful experiment, but it was a decided success."

We pass over a few years here with barely mentioning his successive appointments from 1818 to 1835. He was two years at Watertown; one year at Scipio, and superannuated the next year; at Watertown again, two years; at Homer, one year; at Auburn, one year; at Rochester, two years; at Cazenovia, two years; then presiding elder on Cayuga District, Oneida Conference, four years; and on conference division again, presiding elder on Black River District, in the Black River Conference, two years, when his health failed, and he sought to recruit it by a winter residence in St. Augustine, Florida. These were all important places, and he filled them with great satisfaction to the people, leaving among them decided impressions of his power as a preacher. Fathers and mothers in our Israel at this day love to descant on reminiscences of his sweeping logic and eloquence in those years.

During this ministerial career, especially the latter part of it, his zeal for the cause of God was of the missionary type, ever making him desirous of breaking new ground in the itinerant work. God had given to him a natural poetic fervor; a romantic hopefulness was inwoven with his mental constitution; and divine grace turned all impulses of a natural character into pioneer channels, as well when he entered on the higher plane of a spiritual life as before this, when he was living in youthful wildness and worldliness; so that, to apply one of his favorite figures to himself, this made him, while presiding elder for six years, "like a stream of light" darting through the land, setting up new landmarks, establishing new outposts, and enlarging the borders generally of the Zion which he superintended. Constituted as he was, he was sadly at ease when he could see no progress. He rejoiced in the successes and prospects of our missionary work at home and abroad.

And just here, with his health still requiring a change of climate, and with his long-sustained zeal still unquenched, he complied gladly with the invitation of the Board at New York to go as missionary to Buenos Ayres, South America. Among the Protestants of that city and surrounding country he labored with unintermitting success for six years. The population was shifting and transient for a considerable part, but he gathered respectable congregations, erected a fine church edifice, established day and Sunday-schools, and saw promising results to his labors.

It was to him a new material, however, that he worked upon; a new atmosphere that he breathed; and a new turn was beginning to take place in his intellectual life. From this time his sermons took a character, as if suited to more homogeneous and intelligent audiences; pruned of excrescences, but shown also of their former spirit-stirring power. Confined to one people, and they a mere handful amid the Romanist multitudes of that city, he was not surrounded by the excitements that could inspire the lofty flights of his pulpit genius of olden time, so he poured a considerable part of the enthusiasm natural to him into the grand conception that was to have embodiment and immortal realization in the years to come. Rising to the intellectual level, and sharing in all the sympathies of this conception, every energy of his mind had now its sphere of work on a plane higher than before, and its tasks were redoubled because the plane was still ascending. And equal to the task and struggle now inaugurated was that iron will of his nature, never yet conquered in any corresponding contest, and never to be conquered. Sermons, studies—all—were now raised to this plane, the theater of his mind's working from this time forward.

It was not, then, that he had less zeal than formerly, nor less fire of intellect; but if they appeared less in overmastering discourses, it was because they were taken up into an enterprise of another class, equally sacred, and of vaster compass. While he was presiding elder he was unusually exercised with the greatness of the preacher's work, with the need of more "workmen that need not be ashamed," with the need too of schools for special training with reference to this work. And the impression deepened, and was wrought, while he was in South America, into the purpose of devoting his powers, when he should return, to the building up of special training schools for the ministry. He knew that he had a mountain barrier of prejudice and opposition to scale in reaching his object; but his resolution was fixed, and he committed himself to the work.

Returning from Buenos Ayres in 1842, he took by appointment the pastoral charge, in New York city, of Vestry-street Church one year, then of Mulberry-street Church two years. Meanwhile he consulted, corresponded, and agitated generally

concerning the project that lay deep in his soul. He felt his way into the sentiments and sympathies of a few friends, whom he brought to his help, and gathering this little strength he reconnoitered for a location where first to begin, and found Newbury, Vermont, a favorable point for the initiation of the movement, but in a short time settled permanently the first Biblical Institute at Concord, New Hampshire. Here, in 1847, John Dempster, Osmon C. Baker, and Charles Adams, colleagues in instruction, consecrated this infant seminary to God and the Church—the result of long years of prayer and faith and labor and struggle between hope and fear; and the small band of students gathered there as its first class joined with this Faculty in daily earnest intercessions at the throne of grace, in public and in private, that this institution should be owned and blessed of God, and indorsed by the Methodist Episcopal Church.

Those prayers have been answered. As a reward for enduring, for conscience' sake, obloquy and struggle, which at that time would have been endured by no man less fitted by nature with a strong will and a hopeful spirit, and less endowed by grace with a fervor in a good cause which no indifference, no opposition, no ridicule could quench; a starting point that could not be forfeited to the enterprise was now secured to this good man. He had by this time gained hundreds of friends who before were indifferent, some of whom became the warmest supporters of, and rendered generous material aid to, the enterprise. He traveled thousands of miles, in this country and in Great Britain, making friends and getting funds for it; and after acting seven years as agitator, financier, and instructor, as soon as the institution seemed securely anchored in the interest and affections of the surrounding conferences he resigned it to good hands, to be matured into a fitting character for permanent usefulness, and departed, to pioneer again his grand conception somewhere in the Great West.

Providence went before him. A lady of wealth and great excellence of character had devised by will, in properties situated in the city of Chicago, a sufficient endowment of a theological institution for the Methodist Episcopal Church, to be located within or near the city of Chicago. This fact was known to but few persons, who, when made aware that Dr. Dempster

was seeking a desirable location in the West, warmly invited him to act with them in establishing the preliminary school to what soon after became by charter the "Garrett Biblical Institute," at Evanston. To his glowing faith in Providence, this was a message directly from heaven. He stepped at once into this open door, and was shortly installed, with two teachers, as an instructor of nineteen students for the first year. This preliminary arrangement closing in 1855-6, on the death of Mrs. Garrett, the founder, the permanent Faculty was organized, with himself, by courtesy of his colleagues, titled as the Senior Professor.

Accustomed as he had been to opposition, or at least to indifference and neglect, with reference to this (to him) most sacred calling of founding theological schools in the Methodist Episcopal Church, it did not occur to him but that he should have considerable of the same experience in the West. But he was disappointed; and several reasons existed why he should be. His name, of forty years' high standing in the Church, had traveled long in advance of his coming westward. His successes, already achieved in an enterprise to which his life was *sworn*; achieved in the face of banter, and travesty, and cold indifference, and honest opposition; had also some time preceded his arrival. Society, too, in the West, particularly in the North-west, has not yet settled so compactly into a cast-iron mould as to be unimpressible at the proposal of just measures, even if they *be* novel. An unexpected bequest of great munificence for a Church object, which, with some ancient people, had been outlawed as a reprehensible innovation, produced no flutter here, except of wonder and gratitude; not even in a whole General Conference, which, at that juncture, was assembled in the West. It was an event of Providence, ordered no doubt to *compel* respect for, and then adoption by General Conference of, Biblical Institutes as a recognized agency in the Church for ministerial qualifications. These things made the advent of Dr. Dempster in the West unexpectedly welcome. The work which he felt himself specially called to accomplish, he found, on entering upon it, almost ready formed and prepared to his hand.

It was his own conviction, as well as that of those best acquainted with all sides of his character, that his peculiar mission was to take the position mainly of a pioneer in this work.

He analyzed well the elements of his enterprise, and succeeded in its incipient construction to a degree which any other man, at such a juncture of circumstances in the Church, perhaps could not have reached. Hence he laid plans to proceed still further west and establish similar institutions, first, on the banks of the Platte, at its junction with the Missouri; and next, in California. Steps were taken for the first, but failed, chiefly because of the financial crash that fell on the entire country at the time. This revulsion interrupted the rapid increase of population in the states and territories surrounding the intended location; certain enterprises failed also, which were undertaken by men who were to aid in founding the school; and, this field not having an immediate look of promise, he turned his attention to California. By overtures made in correspondence with the conference of ministers in that state, he was contemplating a journey thither on or about the first of January, 1864. His purpose was, partly to benefit his health, but more to see if, notwithstanding the pressure of debts upon their University, a respectable appropriation from his own resources, added to an earnest special home effort to raise funds, might not soon lead to the establishment of the new institution. It was his declared purpose to give fifteen thousand dollars to this object.

He was convinced that what further work was to be done by him in this line for his Master must be done soon. The weight of years was growing consciously heavier upon him. His health—always precarious since the early years of his ministry, and requiring to be daily guarded by the observance of abstemious diet, stated bodily exercise, regular hours of sleep, and the like—was, during his last year, made more and more feeble by aggravating pains from a tumor of some years' standing. The removal of this tumor he deemed necessary to fit him to endure the voyage to California. The surgeon encouraged him, mistaking the force of his will for the capabilities of his weak, frail frame. The operation proved fatal. He died, after three and a half days of intense bodily pain, November 28, 1863; and his end was peace.

To close this sketch abruptly here, would be to offend proprieties due to a serious and just biographical account. Every good man's life brings forth some notable lessons which should

not fail of opportunity to teach others to be greatly worthy and useful. The character of John Dempster had in it points of abundantly instructive interest, all of which cannot, of course, be presented in the limits to which this article is confined; but the attempt to exhibit a few prominent features of his inner life, however delicate the task, will be expected and demanded. As best we can, then—though, from the nature of the case, at the hazard of some repetition—we will attempt to speak first of his religious character.

In the hedge surrounding the camp-meeting area where he was converted, he is said to have struggled alone the whole night in despair, till the morning sun arose, when the glory of the Sun of righteousness burst also into his soul, and spread light and love through his whole being. From that time, it is said, no man could have exhibited a greater internal and external change. Always, before, on a high key of hilarious enjoyment; now, solemn, and seldom smiling, his soul had inward rejoicing, but was burdened for sinners; and he bore ill also some dark questions in theology. Though this gave his aspect a somewhat somber cast, he was, nevertheless, by nature, a cheerful and hopeful man. It was not common to see him despondent in practical matters and difficulties. Cheerfulness was a marked social feature with him later in life; and if the tradition be true that "he never laughed" in the first part of his religious life, it was because he fell, perhaps unconsciously, into the grave and reverent style of the ministry of that day, or the reaction from his former habits rendered him fixed and unelastic, or the prospective misery of doomed sinners vividly possessed him and made him a weeping Jeremiah, or these all conjoined to produce such an effect. On a camp-meeting occasion, some time after his conversion, Dr. Peck says, "he was in a perfect flame every moment, and when he was not speaking to some one on the subject of religion, he was breathing out prayer, or sighing and weeping over the perilous condition of sinners."

His Christian zeal continued of this type, in the main; though of course, as life advanced, it passed a series of modifications consequent to every one on social changes, on changes in religious measures, on diminished show of emotion produced by increased intellectual tone, and the like; but he lived in habit-

nal prayer, and had, as a special peculiarity, great power with God *in* prayer.

He seldom referred to the past, and often seemed disinclined to speak about inward troubles in religious experience. But to a few it was known that certain problems of Theodicy had often cast dark shadows over his spirit, and that he had, at one or more times in his life, to use his own expressive language on the subject, "approached almost to the verge of insanity in respect to them." He became clear of dark doubts, however, after hard struggles, and after processes of severe ratiocination to overthrow them. But they shaded his pathway occasionally, by signs still of their forthcoming, and sent him to his wonted practice of doing again and again a vigorous battling against them.

Nothing else so easily explains his almost exclusive mental toil within this department of thought. During the larger part of his ministry, his sermons partook of discussion upon some point of the divine ethics, or involved vindication of some aspects of the divine government. In his professorial life the burden of his lectures was upon the related topics of natural theology: revealed theology he left mostly to oral teaching. These things show how deeply his soul entered into such questions; how much he supposed the discussion of them was necessary to the drift of others' felt wants, as well as his own; and they give intimations of silent sighings which no mortal ear was privy to, in relation to enigmas in the working of a free, almighty Providence over a universe of intelligent and responsible beings.

That it was his wont to linger, fondly linger, in this department of thought, is to be accounted for, in part, from the relief his mind felt in his confirmed habit of vigilance in guarding all points whence, otherwise, troops of doubts would come rushing upon him. And that he refrained from alluding to one of the probably real causes of his loving to linger here; that he uttered his conclusions here from rigidly logical premises, without ever openly hinting at the sad distress that impelled him for dear life to search out those premises, arose, in part no doubt, from his shrinking from the world's gaze into a sorrow which he desired should be breathed out to God alone. There was a depth to his nature, and, as grace wrought upon it, to his piety

also, which the world was never permitted to pierce. When the troublesome problems were solved and settled, beyond the power of any capering doubt thereafter to disturb, then was he happy in the harmony of his soul with God. He had long yielded his affections to God, but now his intellect was more clearly at one with him. He walked with God, and, in a sense, lived *in* him. The divine communion was sweetly pervasive, reaching down, down, all around, and throughout all the capacities of his being.

All perplexities in nature over, the revealed economy became to him the easiest possible thing to embrace. No occasion existed to him for even a moment's defense of it. To his receiving faith, it was to every word and to the jot and the tittle accepted. The grounds for its reception lay back in the character of God. Prove *that* to be supremely just and good, without shock or jar to reason in the realm of Providence or government, and his mind scarcely needed aught else more final to the evidence of the divine word. Yet the evidences of Scripture he did not ignore. But in treating of their nature, whether external or internal, nothing fundamental to his argument could be seen except what pertained, after all, to the divine character of its Author. The connection of this with miracle, or with prophecy, or with providentially-ordered testimony, or with self-evidencing truth, was all the importance or value that each possessed. His trust in the Scriptures, therefore, resulted largely from *a priori* grounds of evidence.

This was his tendency—perhaps eccentricity—an eccentricity that rendered him liable to the charge of begging the whole question of scripture evidence. Yet his position on this subject did not necessarily cage him in this trap, for he could avail himself of all the usual arguments besides. But that which met his own personal want was a prior foundation to rest upon. Beyond this, all was secure enough to his soul, if only this be to his mind unmistakably secure. Hence the Scriptures became a solid comfort to him in his lowly devotions. His imagination basked in the light they throw on nature's pages. He soared in the occasional use of their imagery, both in his descriptions of the heavenly state, and when, with terrible power, he depicted the horrors of the lost. He bowed to their authority as implicitly as he would to utterances directly to his ear from the skies. So

childlike was his faith when antecedent problems were not in question.

To one observing, for years, the emotional incitements that stimulated his thought in lecture, in preaching, in conversation, and in common assemblages social and religious, such would seem the legitimate interpretation of his attitude as a religious man. The warmth peculiar to his early devotion was less manifest, not because he necessarily *had* less, but because his field of religious view was amazingly enlarged, and because of the multitudinous objects therein, doctrinal, religious, and speculative, each of which required and divided his interest. But whatever may have been the lack of warmth he did show, he was a deeply devout man. In ordinary devotions his soul thrilled in referring to the atoning mercy of his Saviour, and to the possible recovery of lost man through the divine propitiation. The doctrine of the atonement was above all things *precious* to him. He staked his soul's eternal welfare upon it, because he knew no other way possible to reason or faith by which he could be saved. In humble dependence on this precious doctrine he lived and died.

This representation, however, must not be understood to imply that he was faultless. He had faults, as everybody has faults, and because, like every one else, he was finite. The boundary line that incloses the area of every man's functions and possibilities, is almost infinitely various in the diagram forms it makes. While in the case of a small class of persons it may make a wave-curve, or at least not a disagreeably sinuous outline, yet in the majority of cases it is more or less a zig-zag periphery, starting in a line that jerks with entering, then sometimes with long salient angles, and so proceeds till it comes round to the point of beginning. Possibilities of character that are realized within such areas make what are called *angular* characters. And it is not prejudicing the case to state that the adjustment of features in Dr. Dempster's mind naturally caused him to fall into this type of character. He had such a constitutional condition of affections and faculties as sometimes made him prone to shoot far out into salient and sharp points of opinion and practice, namely, a strong innate *selfhood*, which showed its distinctive form in a propensity for possession; a will that knew no bending when set to accomplish

an object; a logical faculty that sought its favorite premises mostly from interpretations of the mind's own structure; and an imagination which, if at any time not duly regulated by co-ordinate powers, was wont to shed an intense glare and coloring on one or two sides of a subject and leave other sides too much in the dark. Had he been swayed by wholly unregenerate motives, it would have been the property of the first of these, united with the second, to urge on in its bent, and permit no hindering; united with the third, to decide on mistaken methods and objects of saving; united with the last, to sacrifice comfort and ease and style and pleasure, in view of the undimmed luster that would ever have gilded its ultimate object of interest and pursuit.

But this constitutional condition was under the control of divine grace. And yet what was constitutional could not be *unmade* even by grace; and do as he would or might do, with such a native adjustment, subject himself to economy and self-denial, as a means to a good end, as much as he might, he nevertheless suffered often before the world, simply because on this point the world could not understand him. Seeing this, he seldom or never stopped to explain himself to a misapprehending world, and made no change in his course. He early adopted a style of economy and self-denial, which was continued through life, and necessarily brought with it continually increasing savings. But the desire to save was certainly subjected to higher objects and employments. He was too spiritual to allow other than a subordinate place to such desire. He was too intellectual to be able to afford more than the necessary moments to its gratification. He was too absorbed in his life-purpose to establish "schools of the prophets" in all needy localities, to be able to love mere accumulation for its own sake. And so would he have proved, most undoubtedly, had life been spared to him. He hoped for a short period of active career still in which to close up his affairs, with a view to a beneficent appropriation.

There are not even a *few* persons in this world whose course in all respects is to be commended. And he, doubtless, was not blind to faults which, were he to start life again, with pliant influences to begin with, would surely have received attempted correction. Perhaps, however, neither two, nor

two score, of successive probations, each refining on its predecessor, would avail to rid us of some obnoxious traits. We are so hemmed in by limitations; that is to say, we have such short range to our possibilities and means of knowledge, we make up our judgments from premises so insufficient, and we trust so tenaciously to convictions which the slightest illusions will color, that a discriminating and comprehensive charity toward men's faults is a most becoming virtue for every one. The subject of this memoir had this virtue to a commendable degree. Immediate contact with influences or conduct disturbing his interest or his complacency affected him as it affects men generally. But he was generous in his ordinary estimates of the talents and the virtues of men. He had a kind heart. He seldom spoke ill of people; seldom mentioned even their obvious faults. But he was often profuse of remarks in regard to their talents, carrying his admiration in some cases to a questionable extent. Indeed, he was so subjective in mental habit that he studied human character poorly. He applied a wonderful concentration of thought to the abstract study of everything that makes up the constitution of the intellect and the soul, but he had little tact in concreting what he thus studied, with the complicating, every-day activities of the living soul of humanity.

When he gave himself to society, or to visitors, he was urbane and attractive, and in the language of civilities he approached to courtliness. It was not affectation, but a second nature, a product of long habit, in him to employ a sort of stilted language (the cause of which we will presently explain) altogether incongruous with the natural simplicity of his character. But, with his graceful and well-sustained agreeableness in company, this did not essentially mar the usually excellent effect of his address and bearing.

But it is time for us briefly to touch upon other characteristics which for a long period made him so respectably conspicuous before the public—on his standing as a preacher, thinker, theologian, and instructor.

Without being a learned man, in the proper sense of the term, he was remarkable for having the command of some of his powers to a degree rarely attained by our best educated men. By himself, with occasional aid, he had studied the

Latin and Greek and Hebrew languages. It cannot be supposed that his knowledge of these was as exact and comprehensive as under the training of conscientiously thorough masters, it more probably would have been; but the unbroken continuity of interest and purpose with which he pursued these and all his studies secured him a good discipline, and a marvelous power of concentration. He confined himself closely to one subject at a time, never laying it aside till he had gone at least once over the whole of it. Several classical works and the Hebrew Bible, for example, he read from beginning to end. He studied with a definite end in view. The effect of his classical reading was the adoption, in great part, of a new style of vocabulary. His concentrative tendency led him to compact forms of expression. To affect this, the words he chose were limited in number, but select and expressive. But an instructor's hand upon him was obviously wanting here, who would have insisted on the enlargement of his list, culled from Saxon, as well as from Latin sources; and who would have exhibited to him the varying shades of meaning in words of classic origin. Trammeled often by the meagerness of his list, he used the same words over and over, in painstaking discourses, in conversation often, and in unrevised manuscripts; each time, too, with a slightly shifting sense in those words, thus incurring the fault of inexactness of statement and consequent obscurity of meaning. To persons unused to his style, his language sometimes needed translation. But in his revised efforts this fault did not usually appear. It was seldom seen in his later sermons.

It was in the pulpit, we think, that he appeared before select audiences always to the best advantage. Of medium size in person, he stood before his audiences with an unpretentious, yet impressive presence. With countenance pale from feebleness, with attitudes firmly controlled, with gestures few and significant, with eye brilliant and speaking, with voice deep and penetrating, with utterance deliberate, and with sentences of easy length, he proceeded in few words from his text to its thesis, announced his course of discussion, then held intelligent hearers in breathless, some of them in rapt attention by the hour, chaining and overpowering them by compact and unfaltering argumentation. More or less, however, the style of his

thought in sermons was inevitably metaphysical, but more cautiously intruded, and more simply set forth than in class exercises and lectures, and to hearers having neither genius nor taste for this less interest of course was produced.

But herein was apparent the power he possessed, partly natural, but more the result of vigorous self-discipline for fifty years; the power of bending his intellect to whatever subject was before him with an intense concentration. When you thought his topic exhausted, or a special point already sharpened to the utmost, you were startled to see his critical skill applied in a still finer analysis of the subject in hand. Few persons excelled him in this power. And to analytic acuteness was added the ability to retain an unflagging tension of thought amid interruptions. His mind had its seasons of unbending, but the firm hold it took of its subjects of critical study was not permitted to be broken. His health compelled him steadily to take his hours of exercise with the ax, or the woodsaw, or the garden hoe; but omissions to his continuity of thought in his library, whether for exercise or for class lectures, never hindered him from easily taking up his line of thought just at the link of connection at which he had left it. This he could do with no required exertion to collect his energies, and put them at once, with fresh intensity and earnestness, at their accustomed power and speed of working. Such a complete command over the higher powers of intellect was in him the result of saving grace, early effecting a regeneration of his will, emotions, and passions, and giving to his will a right direction, and a momentum such as never abated to his latest breath. Not to the degree, perhaps, yet like to the manner of the prophet Elijah, or of John the Baptist, or of an anchorite of the third century, it made him *love* the discipline of self-imposed severity. This converted that which to others is work, hard, irksome work, into most entertaining play to him, and rendered him able, amid great battling with weakness and poor health, to spend his customary hours, from early morn to his rest-hour at night, for half a century, in educating himself to be a thinker.

A special charm seemed to settle upon many a subject of study that engaged him. The God of nature had given to him a mental eye to see things vividly; to see many things with an enduring glow upon them. The fact that he possessed a rare

and ready command of the comparative faculty we have before intimated. It was represented both in imagination and in discursive trains of thought. Imagination was a born gift to him, but it seldom appeared in the use of the simile. He used the form of thought in which the art of comparison was strongly *implied* only in the metaphor; and often this would not be recognized as such, being concealed in condensed expression. All the while the activities of his mind seemed stimulated by an accessory pictorial phase in which comparison and representation were both combined. It shed light before him in his path of thought, so that if ever his ideas were not clear, it was due not to any darkness that his mind traveled in, but to the artificial expression of them. His was what Sir W. Hamilton, citing Ancillon's *Essais Philosophiques*, would call the imagination of abstraction united with the imagination of feeling. The first glowingly exhibits certain phases of a single object, to the exclusion of other objects, not omitting the sign connecting those phases; the second represents the accessory images, kindred to some conception at the moment, giving it increasing compass, depth, and intensity.

As a consequence, his mind tended to run out long lines of thought, each to an ultimate analysis if possible rather than to comprehend and grapple with bodies or systems of thought in a single generalization. By this we do not mean that he never generalized the results of his analysis into system, but that it seemed more agreeable to him to elaborate the parts of system than to be employed on the synthesis of those parts. As warmly as Kant, more warmly than Leibnitz, he bestowed an untiring zeal upon the scheme of primitive cognitions, and he went "mousing around" all the labyrinths of mind in search of them. He drew from these cognitions his main weapons to ward off the force of a pressing argument against his positions. Whether or not he had settled their full character as primary truths—their absolute necessity and universality—is not the question now; but he used them abundantly in all his reasonings. They served him *chiefly* as elements for premises to every conclusion. Admit them, and his conclusions were, of course, decisive. Deny them, or suspect them, and you were asked to show that they were not ultimate truths by pointing out what decisive truth or principle was antecedent to them.

Few, if any, undertook to do this, because thought, in its last analysis, is not yet settled by philosophy as decisively possible in but comparatively few cases, at the most; and because, moreover, few persons, though questions of this character were all settled, would care to enter the lists with him, unless, like him, they were favored with a vivid and penetrative view of this high region of thought in its length and breadth, and so could trace all the course of thinking in which he dared to be so positive and emphatic. Cautious persons often hesitated to receive his dogmatic averments, not from want of profound respect for his metaphysical acuteness, but from fear lest his enthusiasm over the importance of some partial truth had swollen it to the proportions of a full truth.

Nor was he without caution, without even grave apprehensions, when he discovered that certain speculations which otherwise would have had a dazzling interest to him were drifting, as he thought, to the overthrow of theism. He drew his sword, hotly sharpened, not more upon the *tabula rasa* theory of Locke, which his ardent nature hated, as tending to materialistic atheism, than upon Hamilton's Philosophy of the Conditioned, involving a doctrine of causation and a notion of the inconceivability of the absolute and the infinite, both of which he considered as equivalent to an acknowledgment that there is no God. During the last two years of his life he waged against these speculations a relentless warfare, and was extremely sensitive at any body's seeming toleration of them. He rightly held that the moral feeling within us, as the bond of relation between us and God, is adequate to raise a reliable apprehension of God sufficient to warrant a positive belief in him; and this Hamilton admitted, denying only that the infinite God can, by finite man, be conceived, comprehended, or known as an object of thought. Dr. Dempster was strenuous in opposing Richard Watson's view of succession as a mode of God's existence in time, and rightly: for God does in himself exist out of all relation to time; yet this timeless mode of being, this manner of having all things in time present to him *eternally at once*, so to speak, is a thing absolutely impossible to conceive though doubtless true; and if one mode or attribute of God's being be thus, why should not all modes, all attributes? why should not God, in his essence, be likewise inconceivable?

He was also vigilant in maintaining the immediate agency of God in all the phenomena of nature. And he sometimes insisted on such anthropomorphic terms, expressive of God's agency in nature, that you felt as if you were, for the time, living in the old Hebrew atmosphere of thought, in which the Lord was heard to thunder in the heavens, and the Highest to give forth his voice, and was seen to send out his arrows and to shoot forth his lightnings. And when he added the usual metaphysical coloring to this sensuous view of God's acts in nature, there seemed but a shadow of difference between it and a system of physical pantheism, unless you eliminated from it—as was needful—the burning glow which his ardor had kindled in the subject. The inconveniences to an extreme advocacy of this view arise from inability to conceive or understand how an omnipotent act every moment applied immediately and directly to keep a thing in a made state, differs in degree or manner of application from the original omnipotent act to create that thing; and how, if there be no difference, an omnipotent sustaining act varies, in kind, degree, or manner, from an omnipotent creating act, so as to avoid the conclusion that to sustain nature every moment God must newly create nature every moment. And then, if God does thus newly create it, comes the metaphysical destruction of its identity with what it was ten or two moments ago. For repeating the constitution of a thing over and over does not make it, *per se*, the same thing this moment which it was in any past moment. Besides, “all souls are mine, saith the Lord.” He has absolute proprietorship in mind as well as in matter, for he made and he sustains both. But let absolute identity of mind in its every successive moment be lost, so then will its responsibility also be null. We name inconveniences such as these to show that an extreme statement of even a proper doctrine is liable to the fallacy of proving too much by bringing into the case more than belongs to it.

To all the distinctive doctrines of the Church Dr. Dempster was strenuously loyal. They were to him the best statements of a conscientious interpretation of the Scriptures on the points to which they related. And he taught them, together with the whole evangelical scheme, with such a depth of living spiritual interest in them; with such an entering of his kindled intellect into their vital meaning, that as an instructor, often;

he contributed as well to the spiritual as to the intellectual growth of his students. His best thoughts would often flash out to the great interest and edification of his class when in familiar daily exercise with them. It was here that his greatness was most obvious to them. Long will his name be precious in their memories!

We are compelled by the limits of our space to pass lightly over many topics bearing on his career on which we should dwell with sincere, heartfelt interest. We wish we had space to give our full estimate of him as a hopeful, warm-hearted man of progress. He loved the right as he loved the truth, and his earnest moral feelings impelled him, so far as in him lay, to join irrevocably the true and the right in all efforts at reform, whether in the Church or in civil government. His voice was heard in solemn and eloquent appeal on this subject, both in the General Conference of the Church of his choice, and before the chief magistrate of the nation. His eye too was ever toward the ages before him. He went not back into the past save to draw thence some lessons from errors committed there, as a way-warning to shun mistakes along the line of the future, whither his intense yearnings were directed. He placed his hope of the future on the young and rising talent of the Church—on young men of two generations behind him, with whom his heart did so beat in sympathy, that to the last day of life he was a fine specimen of a *young* old man.

No doubt he heeded too little the warnings of his bodily decay, because his will was firm and elastic as ever, his hopes as bright, his mental powers as vigorous as in years ago; and the illusion of possibly a decade of years to come, despite his feebleness, temporary, as he hoped, may perhaps have flattered him into the hope of full time yet to revise his piles of manuscript material, and digest them into publications of permanent worth. His work of pioneering in Biblical Institutes must first be finished, then he was ready, as earnestly urged by friends, to put his critiques and monographs in such form and character that the world would not willingly let them die. His work, long contemplated, on the Will was not completed. It will go to the press in the form of lectures, as he delivered them; but the revisions and the chasms which his own hand should have supplied will be untouched; nevertheless they

will have great interest to the thousands of his friends and former pupils. His latest writings of public interest were a series of papers in a weekly journal, introductory to a course of essays on Natural Theology, which he also hoped to have full opportunity yet to finish.

The truth in his case was, that his intense and deep nature was ever fastening itself on plans of work yet to be executed. With great painstaking to preserve his habitually feeble health he had protracted his years far beyond what was once deemed a possible expectation, and he was doubtless fond of trusting that he might reasonably lay down his programme of mental work for many years longer. The reward, in this life, for half a century of self-denial and hard thinking, he did hope to enjoy; but he died on the threshold of his reward, *in* hope, but not in possession.

And we cannot repress the sorrow that comes every day unbidden for such a sudden disappearance from us of a nature so morally earnest, and of a mind so profoundly analytic and conceiving plans so broad and promising. But his work was done; and we honor his name. We honor him for creating such necessity, and inspiring such enthusiasm in minds around him to be earnest thinkers. We honor him, because, under the most stinted privilege, he was such a *marvel* of success in becoming himself, in given directions, the strongest of thinkers. We are sure that he lamented the one-sidedness of his education. We know that he deplored the disadvantage of having had no instructors; no liberalizing atmosphere of learned halls for the moulding and sustaining of his intellectual growth, none of the sobering attritions that occur in daily recitation drill, and in hourly fellowship with earnest collaborators in study. And we know too how consuming was his ardor to leave nothing undone on his part, to offer every needed privilege to the generations of the Christian ministry that are to follow. In this mission, as well as in all his work for his Master and the Church, his eye was single, he walked by faith, and he lived in humble, habitual prayer. He filled distinguished posts with fidelity and success. Nine times he was appointed to serve in the quadrennial councils of the Church. His name and work are a savor of life in Great Britain and in both Americas. He will go down to posterity with reputation and honor.

ART. II.—THE UNAUTHORIZED CALVINISM OF THE
ENGLISH BIBLE.

THE authorized English version of the Holy Bible is perhaps as faultless as any modern translation. It by no means follows, however, that it is a *perfect* representation of the original. It has been well said that "to err is human." Men investigate and understand according to the bias of their minds. The authors of the English translation were neither infallible nor free from prejudice. While the Oriental Churches, both Greek and Syriac, maintained the primitive doctrines held by the Church before Augustine brought in predestination and necessitated will, and even the Romish communion, while respecting the authority of Augustine, declined to accept his fatalism, Protestantism early and prevalently became infected with what is now termed Calvinism. It was thus the great theological misfortune of that age that in abolishing the abuses in the ritual and institutions of popery it departed from some of the original doctrines of Christianity and the general Church.

When Luther was opposing the corrupt doctrines and practices of the Romish Church, with its pompous and multifarious ceremonies, its penances, confessions, absolutions, and priestly assumptions, he readily and naturally passed to the opposite extreme of denying the good of all human effort, and even of asserting that there is no freedom of the will. He was the more inclined to these views from the fact that the Augustinian order of monks to which he belonged, whose doctrines he had early imbibed, and whose writings and libraries had been his chief study, followed the predestinarian theories of Augustine. These views being thus grafted upon the Reformation, spread with its growth. Afterward Calvin gave them a permanent form, and established them with all that force which this position, learning, eloquence, and genius could so well give.

These doctrines became thus not only the most prominent, but, we might say, the prevalent views of the Reformation. The discussions concerning them were not so much with respect to their truth as to the manner in which we should understand them, whether as supralapsarian or sublapsarian. Though Arminius afterward arose and opposed them, yet his views

were condemned by the Synod of Dort, and Calvinism was publicly indorsed as alone orthodox. The errors of Pelagianism, which were propagated to some extent about this time, also did much to bring Arminianism into disrepute. The adherents of Calvin, blinded by their prejudices, either could not or would not see the difference between the teachings of the two systems, and a favorite method of confuting the latter was by imputing to them the errors of the former. Moreover, the philosophy of the age was all arrayed in favor of Calvinism, and whoever would aspire to the title of metaphysician must be a firm believer in the passiveness of man and the irresistibility of the laws of nature. Even at the present time our metaphysicians, in their doctrines on the human will, are not altogether free from the chimerical, foolish, and corrupt dogmas of the schoolmen. Subsequently to the time of James, under whom our translation of the Bible was made, Archbishop Laud endeavored to restore in England the primitive doctrines, which was one of the reasons of his execution by his Puritan opposers. A lax Arminianism prevailed in the English Church, but it was not until the Wesleys that the doctrines taught by Arminius himself were fully exemplified not only in their theory, but their practical spirit and power. Bishop Burnet, in his *History of the Reformation in England*, informs us (vol. ii, p. 180) that in that country the doctrines of predestination were not only the prevailing orthodoxy in the middle of the sixteenth century, but that some carried them so far as to "reckon that since everything was decreed, and the decrees of God could not be frustrated, therefore men were to leave themselves to be carried by these decrees. This drew some into great impiety of life, and others into desperation." The excesses of these men induced Luther to change his views, and Melancthon to openly write against them. Under such influences and prejudices our translation was given to the world. It is no wonder, therefore, that there are in it so many unwarrantable expressions favoring Calvinism.

No one word of our Bible exhibits more strongly the rigid predestinarian views of the translators than their use of the word "ordain." Where the sacred writers speak of things as "made," "appointed," "disposed," "placed," etc., these men, thoroughly leavened with predestinarianism, conceive of them readily as ordained. This word is in twenty-one places of the New Test-

ament, and is used as the translation of no less than twelve different Greek words, namely, γίγνομαι, *to become*, Acts i, 22; διατάσσω, *to arrange, set in order, dispose, command*, 1 Cor. vii, 17; ix, 14; Gal. iii, 19; κατασκευάζω, *to prepare, provide*, Heb. ix, 6; καθίστημι, *to set up, appoint*, Heb. v, 1; viii, 3; Titus i, 5; κρίνω, *to judge, decide*, Acts xvi, 4; ὀρίζω, *to bound, determine, mark out*, Acts x, 42; xvii, 31; 1 Cor. ii, 7; προγράφω, *to write or describe before, to write in public*, Jude 4; προετοιμάζω, *to prepare before*, Eph. ii, 10; ποίεω, *to make, appoint*, Mark iii, 14; τάσσω, *to set in order, dispose*, Acts xiii, 48; Rom. xiii, 1; τίθημι, *to place, set, appoint*, John xv, 16; 1 Tim. ii, 7; χειροτονέω, *to elect by voting with the uplifted hand*, Acts xiv, 23; and once it is introduced without any corresponding word in the Greek, namely, Rom. vii, 10: "And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death." Where is the necessity for thus inserting this word? It will be seen from the above list that *ordain*, as the translation of ὀρίζω, which is the only Greek word used by the inspired writers that can be said to correspond to it in the sense of determine, or destine, and which in its compound form, προορίζω, is the only word rendered in the Bible *predestinate*, (see Rom. viii, 29, 30; Eph. i, 5, 11,) is found only in three places, namely, Acts x, 42. Speaking of Christ, it is said that he "was *ordained* of God to be the Judge of quick and dead;" and again, (xvii, 31,) "He hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath *ordained*;" and lastly, in 1 Cor. ii, 7, where the apostle speaks of the wisdom of God, "even the hidden wisdom, which God *ordained* before the world unto our glory," where the context plainly shows that a comparison is made between the wisdom of the world and the plan of redemption as now revealed, that this was the plan God had determined from the beginning, though only now consummated.

In like manner we find this word occurs twenty times in the Old Testament, and it is used in those places as the translation of eleven different Hebrew words, namely, יָסַד, *to place, put, set*, 1 Chron. ix, 22; Psal. viii, 2; בָּנָה, *to set up firmly, to create*, Psal. viii, 3; נָתַן, *to give*, 2 Kings xxiii, 5; Jer. i, 5; קָדַשׁ, *to appoint*, Dan. ii, 24; קָמַד, *to stand, set up*, 2 Chron. xi, 15; קָרַךְ, *to set in order*, Psal. cxxxii, 17; Isa. xxx, 33; עָשָׂה, *to make*, Num. xxviii, 6; 1 Kings xii, 32, 33; עָשָׂה, *to make, create, pre-*

pare, Psa. vii, 13; קָם, *to rise up, to cause to stand*, Esth. ix, 27; שָׁם, *to put, set, place*, 1 Chron. xvii, 9; Psa. lxxxi, 5; Hab. i, 12; שָׁם, *to set, put, with dative to give*, Isa. xxvi, 12;* and twice, namely, 2 Chron. xxiii, 18; xxix, 27, it is arbitrarily inserted in italics. By what rules of interpretation can such a miscellaneous use of this word be accounted for? The common acceptance of most of the original words is very different from that of our "ordain," while no one of them is identical with it, unless it be the Greek *ορίζω*. Is there anything, then, in the context that requires this word to be used instead of the ordinary signification of the words so translated? If this were admitted, would it not argue a great lack of judgment in the inspired writers in the choice of words to express their meaning? If they meant ordain, why did they not use the word that would have conveyed their meaning clearly? Where such word was not used, it is fair to presume that such was not their meaning. Moreover, what passage of Scripture is there where ordain is used, the meaning of which would not be conveyed as well, yea better, by the ordinary English equivalent of the original word?

We have spoken of only one use of this word, namely, to destine or decree, because in those places in our version where the signification from the use of this word is seemingly to consecrate, or install into office, there is nothing in the original to indicate such act of consecration. The Hebrew expression corresponding to our ordain, with the meaning to consecrate to a particular office or duty, is מָלַךְ אֶת־כָּל־אֶחָד, *to fill the hand of any one*, which is rendered in the Septuagint Greek version by the equivalent phrases πληροῦν τὴν χεῖρα, *to fill the hand of any one*, Judges xvii, 5-12; 1 Kings xiii, 33; τελειοῦν τὰς χεῖρας, *to make perfect the hands of any one*, Exod. xxix, 9-35; Lev. viii, 33; Num. iii, 3; and once this verb is used alone, Lev. xxi, 10; πλήσουαι χεῖρας ἀντῶν, *they shall fill their hands*, Ezek. xliii, 26; and ἐμπλήσεις ἀντῶν τὰς χεῖρας, *thou shalt fill their hands*, Exod. xxviii, 41. This Hebrew phrase is uniformly rendered "to consecrate" in the English Bible, where the ordination of the priests and Levites is referred to. A part of this ceremony of consecration of the Levites,

* The corresponding words of the Septuagint are ἀπαιτέω, Isa. xxx, 33; γίγνομαι, Num. xxviii, 6; δίδωμι, Isa. xxi, 12; 2 Kings xxiii, 5; ἐξεργάζομαι, Psa. vii, 13; ἐτοιμάζω, Psa. cxxxii, 17; θεμελιώ, Psa. viii, 3; ἵστημι, 1 Chron. ix, 22; Esth. ix, 27; καταρτίζω, Psa. viii, 2; καθίστημι, Dan. ii, 24; 2 Chron. xi, 15; ποίεω, 1 Kings xii, 32, 33; τάσσω, Hab. i, 12; τίθημι, 1 Chron. xvii, 9; Psa. lxxxi, 5; Jer. i, 5.

as described in Num. viii, 10, consisted in the laying on of the hands of those who assisted at such ceremonies. This part of the Jewish rites was retained by the apostles in the ordination of deacons and elders for the Christian Church, (Acts vi, 6; xiii, 3; 1 Tim. iv, 14; v, 22.) None of these expressions, however, are found in the Hebrew, the Septuagint, or the New Testament Greek; nor is there any word signifying to hallow, consecrate, or sanctify, in those places where ordain is used in the English Bible. While, therefore, it is possible that the translators designed to convey the idea of consecration in 2 Kings xxiii, 5; 1 Chron. ix, 22; 2 Chron. xi, 15; Jer. i, 5; Mark iii, 14; Acts i, 22; xiv, 23; 1 Tim. ii, 7, and Titus i, 5; yet, when we take into consideration the force of the corresponding words in the original Scriptures it is equally, and perhaps in most instances more probable, that they meant to use the word in its signification of destine. Such common use of this word indicates plainly the bias of mind and manner of thinking of the translators. The doctrines of foreordination and the eternal decrees had been so long and firmly believed that the character of the people had in a degree become moulded by them; and so familiar to their minds were the words used to express their views that even when speaking of human purposes and appointments, these words were the most fitting representative of their ideas, and their language naturally took the same form of expression. In view of the above facts, it will readily appear that but little confidence can be placed in this word as teaching the dogmas of Calvinism in those passages that are usually quoted in proof of those doctrines. We will now examine these more specifically.

We read in Acts xiii, 48: "And as many as were ordained to eternal life believed." The Greek word *τεταγμέναι*, here rendered *ordained*, is, in its primitive usage, a military term, having reference to the marshaling of troops; nor is there in it any semblance to the idea of foreordination. In no other place where it occurs in the New Testament is it rendered ordain, except in Rom. xiii, 1: "For the powers that be are ordained (*τεταγμέναι*) of God;" and there the marginal reading is "ordered." Wesley's paraphrase, which conveys the meaning more accurately, is, "Are subordinate to, or orderly disposed under God." If we seek for other instances of the New Testa-

ment usage of this word, we shall find nothing to justify the translation given in this passage. In Acts xv, 2 it is rendered "they determined;" in 1 Cor. xvi, 15, "they addicted themselves;" in Acts xx, 13 we learn that Paul went on foot to Assos, "for so he was disposed," (*διατεταγμένος ἦν*.) In the Septuagint it is of quite common use, both in its simple form and also as compounded with the preposition *παρὰ*, to denote the arrangement or disposition of troops for battle. (See 1 Mac. v, 27; 2 Mac. xv, 20; 2 Sam. x, 8, 9, 17; 1 Chron. xix, 17; 2 Chron. xiii, 3; xiv, 10, etc.) Benson, in his Commentary, speaking of the military use of this word, says: "It expresses or refers at once to the action of the commander marshaling them, and to their own presenting themselves in their proper places." So also Dr. Doddridge, as quoted by him, says: "This I take to be precisely its sense here, and have therefore chosen the word *determined*, as having an ambiguity something like that in the original. The meaning of the sacred penman seems to be that all who were deeply and seriously concerned about their eternal happiness (whether that concern began now or were of longer date) *openly* embraced the Gospel." Watson, Fletcher, Horne, and Dr. Whitby render this passage, "And as many as were disposed for eternal life believed." Dr. Heylin, Waterland, and others, as quoted by Benson, render it, "As many as were in a fit disposition for eternal life believed." Dr. Hammond renders it, "Fitly disposed and qualified for;" Dr. Wall, "Fit to receive."

The next example to which we invite attention is Jude 4: "For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation," *προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα*. The Greek word *προγεγραμμένοι*, here rendered "before ordained," is a perfect participle from *προγραφω*, and literally translated would be, *written or described before*. Wesley renders the passage, "Who were of old described before, with respect to this condemnation." Horne, in his "Introduction," mentions a judicial usage that throws much light on these words. He says, (vol. ii, p. 55,) "Those who were summoned before courts of judicature were said to be *προγεγραμμένοι εἰς κρίσιν*, because they were cited by posting up their names in some public place; and to these judgment was published or declared in writing. The Greek writers applied the term *προ-*

γεγραμμενους to those whom the Romans called *proscriptos*, or *proscribed*; that is, whose names were posted up in writing in some public place, as persons doomed to die, with a reward offered to whoever would kill them." The evident and plain meaning of the inspired writer in this passage is not that God had foreordained certain men to be thus wicked, but that the very wickedness of which these men were guilty was of olden times described; namely, in the historical parts of the Scriptures; with the condemnation of those people who practiced such things. He then, in proof of this, proceeds to mention those to whom he refers, namely, the Israelites who, though delivered from Egypt, were yet slain in the wilderness; the angels which kept not their first estate; Sodom and Gomorrah; Cain and Korah; and the ungodly antediluvians to whom Enoch preached. So, he gives them to understand that if any now, who have once even known the grace of the Lord Jesus, should presume thereupon, and should make that grace a license to sin and to all manner of heretical belief, they may know that their previous knowledge of the way of life will not save them from the condemnation due to their sins. Where in all this is there anything like foreordination?

There is but one other place in the New Testament where "ordain" is used which is referred to in proof of the doctrine of predestination, namely, Eph. ii, 10: "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." The word here translated "before ordained" is *προητοίμασεν*. As it is correctly rendered in the margin of our reference Bibles "before prepared," nothing more is necessary than to call attention to the fact that the marginal rendering is the correct one, and the only one that the word will bear.

The use of "foreordain," in those passages where it is found, is no more justifiable than is that of ordain. This word occurs twice: first, in Rom. iii, 25, "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood." In the marginal reading, there is "foreordained" in the place of "set forth." The original is *προέθετο*, which is correctly rendered "set forth" in the text. The second example is 1 Peter i, 20: speaking of our redemption through the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish, the apostle says, "Who verily was fore-

ordained before the foundation of the world," etc. The Greek is *προεγνωσμένου*, meaning simply *foreknown*. Both of these passages, it will be seen, refer to Christ; and though the doctrine thus taught may be true, yet in neither of them does the Greek justify the translation "foreordained."

We would next call attention to the word *σὰρξ*, and the adjective *σαρκικός* derived from it. The translation of these in some places by the theological term "carnal," has caused many to believe that there is a word in the original corresponding to this term, entirely different from the word rendered "flesh," and consequently, that where the latter word is used it is to be understood in its common acceptation; hence they are led to believe in the natural sinfulness of matter, and the impossibility of Christian perfection till freed from the body. Had these words been rendered without the intervention of this theological term to becloud the mind of the reader, their use would have been evident, one passage explaining another. Or, since a discrimination was made in part, if it had been carried on through the Scriptures, without the warping of a perverse theology, it might have saved the Christian world from much error. What an inconsistent mixing up of the words "carnal" and "flesh" do we find in Romans viii, 4-9: "That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, (*κατὰ σάρκα*,) but after the Spirit. For they that are after the flesh (*κατὰ σάρκα*) do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit, the things of the Spirit. For to be carnally minded (*φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς*) is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace. Because the carnal mind (*φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς*) is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh (*ἐν σαρκὶ*) cannot please God. But ye are not in the flesh, (*ἐν σαρκὶ*,) but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you." Again, in the twelfth and thirteenth verses, "Therefore, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh, (*τῇ σαρκὶ*,) to live after the flesh, (*κατὰ σάρκα*,) For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die; but if ye through the Spirit do mortify (put to death, *θανατοῦτε*) the deeds of the body; (*πράξεις τοῦ σώματος* or *τῆς σαρκὸς*,) ye shall live." What is the force of the expression "so then" in the eighth verse, unless *ἐν σαρκὶ* is here spoken of the carnal nature? Evidently *κατὰ σάρκα* is to be understood in the same manner.

Why should φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς be translated "carnal mind," and τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς, which has the same grammatical construction, be rendered "things of the flesh," instead of "carnal things?" So also πράξεις τοῦ σώματος or τῆς σαρκὸς should be "carnal deeds."

In Gal. v, 19-21, etc., is described the difference between the carnal and the spiritual man, as is evident from the works attributed to them: "Now the works of the flesh (τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκὸς) are manifest, which are these: adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revelings, and such like." The expression τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκὸς is of the same form as φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς of Rom. viii, 6, 7, or δικαιώμασι σαρκὸς of Heb. ix, 10; and if these latter ought to be rendered "carnal mind," "carnally minded," "carnal ordinances," with equal reason should this be "carnal works." For if we could say that some of the sins here mentioned were sins of the flesh, yet how could this be said of witchcraft, hatred, etc.? Is it true, moreover, that Christians, so long as they are in the flesh, are to expect to do such things as are here mentioned, and still retain their Christian character? Is it true that the body and the soul are in such antagonism that the one lusteth against the other, etc.? Does not our Saviour teach that it is the soul, and not the body, that is the source of sin?—Matt. xv, 19: "For out of the *heart* proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies: these are the things which defile a man." So also Jeremiah (xvii, 9) declares: "The *heart* is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked." Solomon says, Ecclesiastes ix, 3, "Also the *heart* of the sons of men is full of evil." And the apostle says, in the same verse in which he closes the enumeration of these works, "That they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." The entire scope of the chapter teaches that it is the carnal nature of which he is here speaking, and which he enjoins upon them to crucify with its lusts. Again, when Paul says, in Rom. vii, 18, "For I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, (ἐν τῇ σαρκί,) dwelleth no good thing," are we to suppose him as believing the heathen dogma, that matter is essentially corrupt and that the body is the source of all sin, or rather, that he is here speaking of the

carnal nature? How much more consistently with the doctrines of Christianity would it read, "For I know that in me, that is, carnally, dwelleth no good thing." Other examples might be cited, but these are sufficient to show the prevalence of Calvinistic views in the translation of this word.

In the rendering of the Greek *ἐκλεκτός* there is the same variableness and source of misapprehension. In many instances the theological term "elect" is used, while in other places it is otherwise rendered; thus conveying to the minds of many people that there is a Greek word of similar theological import to our "elect." With many, this word is the end of all controversy; because the Bible speaks of *the elect* it is good and sufficient proof to such that God did certainly elect and foreordain a certain and definite number, from eternity, to be saved in heaven, irrespective of any foreknowledge of their lives and characters. Had the Greek been uniformly rendered, this fallacy of many good people would have been avoided. This is a word of quite frequent use in the Greek Scriptures. Its common acceptation is chosen, fit to be chosen, choice, excellent, or approved; nor is there in it any such idea as the theological word "elect" conveys. It is entirely gratuitous, therefore, to say that because certain men are called *ἐκλεκτοὶ* therefore they are elected or predestinated to heaven. With equally good logic we might affirm that the authors of the Septuagint translation believed that "the seven fat kine," (*τὰς ἐπτά βόας τὰς ἐκλεκτάς, the seven elect cows*), Gen. xli, 20, and "the seven rank (*ἐκλεκτοὺς, elect*) and full ears," Gen. xli, 7, which Pharaoh saw in his dream; or the "ten fat oxen," (*μοσχοὶ ἐκλεκτοὶ, elect oxen*), and the "fat roebucks," (*δορκάδων ἐκλεκτῶν, elect roebucks*), that were daily prepared for Solomon's table, 1 Kings iv, 23; or the "six choice sheep," (*πρόβατα ἐξ ἐκλεκτῶν, elect sheep*), that were daily served at Nehemiah's table, Neh. v, 18, were thus predestinated to eternal life in heaven. We read in Judges xx, 16, "among all this people there were seven hundred chosen (*ἐκλεκτοὶ, elect*) men left-handed." Again, in Psa. lxxviii, 31, "The wrath of God came upon them, and slew the fattest of them, and smote down the chosen (*ἐκλεκτοὺς, elect*) men of Israel." In 1 Sam. x, 24, speaking of Saul, Samuel says, "See ye him whom the Lord hath chosen?" (*ἐκλέλεκται, elected*.) (See also 2 Sam. xxi, 6.) If in these and like instances

the word "elect" had been used in our translation, none would have misconstrued it.

But why should one meaning be given to the word in these examples, and another in other parts of the Scriptures, when there is nothing in the context to require or justify such different and technical usage? Thus, in 2 John 1, did the apostle John certainly know that the lady to whom he wrote was elected according to God's eternal decree? If so, where have we the account of God's thus revealing the names of the elected? and how then could he consistently exhort her and her children, in verse 8, "Look to^s yourselves, that we lose not those things which we have wrought?" (*gained* in the margin.) When Paul, in writing to the Church at Thessalonica, says, (1 Thess. i, 4,) "Knowing, brethren beloved, your election of God," does he mean to teach them that the entire Church membership were certainly predestinated to Heaven? Yet he says, (2 Thess. iii, 6,) "Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly;" and again, verse 11, "For we hear that there are some which walk among you disorderly." In the third chapter of this first epistle he speaks of the doubts he had been troubled with concerning them, and says, "I sent to know your faith, lest by some means the tempter have tempted you, and our labor be in vain;" but when he had heard from them by Timothy, he was comforted, and rejoiced for their sakes. (Verses 5, 7, 9.) He is not speaking here, then, of the certainty of their gaining heaven, but of their present approval by God, as manifest by their faith and good works. This passage would be better translated, therefore, "Knowing, brethren beloved, your approval by God." Among the various spiritual gifts mentioned in the Scriptures, we have no account of any gift of the foreknowledge of individual persons' future destiny. Instead of this, we find even Paul expressing a fear lest he himself should be a castaway. (1 Cor. ix, 27.)

What is there in the expression τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν ἀγγέλων (1 Tim. v, 21) to justify the translation "the elect angels" rather than the approved, or worthy, or excellent angels? If they were elected, to what were they elected? Does not the language of Jude 6 expressly imply that the holy angels are they who have kept their first estate? But if they were in the enjoy-

ment of "everlasting life" previously, how can it be said that they are "predestinated unto" it? When we remember that this is the only passage that the compilers of the Presbyterian Confession of Faith have advanced in proof of their doctrine, that "God, by an eternal and immutable decree, out of his mere love for the praise of his glorious grace, to be manifested in due time, hath elected some angels to glory," (Confession of Faith, chap. iii, sec. 3. Larger Catechism, Ques. 13 and 19,) we may readily see that there is nothing in the Scriptures that requires the Calvinistic rendering of the word as given in our version. We might in like manner cite every instance where the word *elect* occurs in the Bible, and we should find that not only is there no necessity for the use of this word in these instances, any more than in other places where the Greek is differently rendered, but also that the real meaning would be more truly and comprehensibly expressed by the use of some other word.

We read in Acts ii, 47: "And the Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved." As thus rendered the text sounds strongly Calvinistic; as though there were certain men whom the Lord had predetermined should be saved, and now he was daily adding such to the Church. But does the original justify such phraseology? The words *τοὺς σωζόμενους*, which are rendered "such as should be saved," convey no idea of futurity; they are simply a present participle in the passive or middle voice and the definite article, and literally translated would be in the passive, "the saved," and in the middle voice, which from the context would seem to be the one designed by the writer, (see verse 40,) "those saving themselves." So far as the grammatical form of the participle is concerned there is no means for determining which voice it is in. Wesley renders it, "Those who were saved;" Bengel, "Those being saved." This same participle occurs in four other places of the New Testament, (Luke, xiii, 23; 1 Cor. i, 18; 2 Cor. ii, 15; Rev. xxi, 24;) but in none of these have the translators given such a strained interpretation as in the text under consideration. Horne in his "Introduction," (vol. i, p. 423,) says of this passage: "We may remark" that it has "*no relation* whatever to the doctrine of election; that Luke is speaking as a historian of a fact which fell under his own

observation, relating to the Jews and not to the hidden counsels of God; and that if the translators of our authorized version had rendered the original literally, as they have done in other parts of the New Testament, it would have run thus: 'The Lord added daily to the Church the saved;' that is, those who were saved from their sins and prejudices; and so the passage is rendered by Drs. Whitby, Doddridge, and other eminent divines."

As 1 Peter ii, 8, now reads, it conveys to the minds of many people the impression that God has appointed certain men to disobedience; a meaning entirely foreign to the context. If it had been rendered, "The unbelieving stumble at the word," or "Even to them who being disobedient (*ἀπειθοῦντες*, *unbelieving*) stumble at the word, whereunto also they were appointed," the meaning of the sacred penman would have been much more evident. It is the stumbling because of their unbelief to which they were appointed. Dr. Adam Clarke gives in his Commentary the following as a translation, supported by many learned critics: "Also a stone of stumbling and a rock of offense. The disobedient stumble against the word, (or doctrine,) to which verily they were appointed."

In 1 Sam. ii, 25, we read: "Notwithstanding they hearkened not unto the voice of their father, because the Lord would slay them." This rendering makes God the author of the wickedness done, and Eli's sons the passive medium through which God violates his own law, while they are at the same time the recipients of the divine wrath on account of the breaking of the law. It is true that *כי* does frequently mean "because," yet when we consider the wide range of signification which the Hebrew particles have, we can readily see that the passage will bear a much more consistent and God-honoring interpretation. Had it been rendered "by," "though," "so," or "therefore," no violence would have been done to the language, and the verse would have been consistent with the rest of the history, thus: "Notwithstanding they hearkened not to the voice of their father, therefore the Lord would slay them."

In the translation of verbs in the future tense there is similar evidence of Calvinistic perversions. The English language has two forms, "shall" and "will," by which to express the future, the Greek but one; by which one of these auxiliaries therefore we

should render a given word must be determined by the context and the general scope of the passage; yet all know how different the meaning as one or the other of these is used. "Will" indicates the subject of the verb as acting, and frequently in the second and third persons is simply predictive of the future; while "shall" in many cases has the force of an imperative, and frequently indicates that the real cause of the action lies, not so much in the subject of the verb, as in some power acting on that subject. How harshly imperative does John vi, 37, read: "All that the Father giveth to me shall come to me," presenting God's people as coming to Christ not so much because of their own desires and voluntary choice, as constrained and compelled by the irresistible decree. How much better would it read, All that the Father giveth to me will come to me. If, in 2 Tim. iii, 12, 13, "Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution. But evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse," the auxiliaries were changed, how different would the meaning be: Yea, and all that shall live godly in Christ Jesus will suffer persecution. But evil men and seducers will wax worse. (See also Dan. xii, 10; 1 Kings xxii, 20; Acts xiii, 22; Matt. xxiv, 5-7, 9-12, 24; 1 Tim. iv, 1; 2 Tim. iii, 1, 2, etc.)

Words supplied in italics are another source of error. Psa. cx, 3, reads, "Thy people *shall be* willing in the day of thy power." This is a favorite text with Calvinists to show God's power over the will, and the auxiliary "shall" is spoken with violent emphasis, as though it were an end of all controversy. "Shall be" is, however, printed in italics, indicating that it is not found in the original; and the word *קָדַשׁ*, rendered "willing," is a noun, signifying in its usual acceptation "free-will offerings." (See Lev. xxii, 18, 21, 23; xxiii, 38; Num. xv, 3; Deut. xii, 6, 17; xvi, 10; xxiii, 23; Psa. cxix, 108; Ezra i, 4; iii, 5; vii, 16; viii, 28; 2 Chron. xxxi, 14," etc. Read it without the words supplied, "Thy people free-will offerings in the day of thy power." Is not the meaning evidently, Thy people offer, or will offer, free-will offerings, etc.; or, as Gesenius renders it in his Hebrew Lexicon, "Thy people are free-will offerings?" etc. But what is there to justify the Calvinistic rendering given in our Bible?

Again, Heb. x, 38: "Now the just shall live by faith: but

if *any man* draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him." In this text the words "*any man*" have been supplied, entirely perverting the sense by giving the verse a meaning which the translators may have wished, but which the original by no sophistry can be made to bear. It would properly read, The just shall live by faith, and if he draw back my soul shall have no pleasure in him. On this text Dr. A. Clarke says: "The insertion of the words *any man*, if done to serve the purpose of a particular creed, is a wicked perversion of the words of God. They were evidently intended to turn away the relative from the antecedent, in order to save the doctrine of final and unconditional perseverance, which doctrine this text destroys."

Col. ii, 6, reads: "As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, *so* walk ye in him." By supplying the word *so* the text is made to mean simply that with what faith, self-consecration, etc., we first received Christ, *so* we ought now to walk; whereas it is an exhortation to perseverance, and should read: "As (or since) ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, walk ye in him."

The last passage that we have space to mention is Rom. ix, 11, 12: "(For the children being not yet born, neither having done anything good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth,) it was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger." This text is regarded by many Calvinists as a perfect Gibraltar, invincible to all the assaults, and a complete refutation, of Arminianism; and if it were a correct transcript of the original it would certainly not be the weakest argument that is brought in defense of Calvinism. But the words "the children" are not in the original, nor are they the ones which the Scripture history teaches should be inserted. The reference is plainly not to the personal salvation of Jacob in heaven and damnation of Esau in hell, but the election of one to peculiar temporal privileges, and to the superiority of his descendants over those of the other. If the translators had taken the time and pains to refer to the place where these things were "said to her," they must have seen, unless blinded by their Calvinistic prejudices, that the prediction was not of the children personally, but of their descendants. The place is Gen. xxv, 23: "And the Lord said

unto her, Two nations are in thy womb, and two manner of people shall be separated from thy bowels; and the one people shall be stronger than the other people; and the elder shall serve the younger." Is it not, then, perfectly evident that the word "nations," or "people," should have been supplied here, and not children? Aside from this plain language, the history of Jacob and Esau teaches the same truth. Esau never did serve Jacob, nor was Jacob stronger than his brother; but the Edomites did serve the Israelites. (See 2 Sam. viii, 14; 1 Kings xi, 14-16; xxii, 47; 2 Kings xiv, 7; viii, 20-22; 1 Chron. xviii, 13; 2 Chron. xxi, 8, 10; xxv, 11, 12.) Even Dr. Scott, in his Commentary, though explaining this chapter according to Calvinistic views, yet admits: "It has often been urged that Jacob and Esau were not so much personally intended as their posterity, and that temporal and not eternal things are spoken of, and this is certainly true. Jacob never had dominion over Esau personally, but his posterity ruled over Esau's." Dr. Clarke says: "As the word children is not in the text, the word nations would be more proper, for it is of nations the apostle speaks." In view of these facts, to what can we attribute the unauthorized insertion of the word children but to the prepossessions of the age at the time the translation was made?

We here take leave of our subject, believing that the examples already adduced are amply sufficient to convince any unprejudiced mind that our present authorized version of the Bible is the translation of men who were biased by Calvinistic prejudices. It might, without any great impropriety, be called the Calvinistic Translation. Notwithstanding this discouraging and opposing influence, Arminianism has made marvelous progress during the past hundred years. What might we not then expect if an impartial translation could be put into the hands of the people?

ART. III.—EDWARD LIVINGSTON.

Life of Edward Livingston. By CHARLES HAVENS HUNT. With an Introduction by GEORGE BANCROFT. New York: Appleton & Co.

THE lives of the distinguished brothers, Robert R. and Edward Livingston, intertwined as they were with the history of their country, ought before this to have been written. While Edward, nineteen years the younger, was a boy at school, Robert was playing a prominent part in the opening scenes of the American Revolution. He continued to be one of the leading spirits, as chairman of the committee that drafted the Constitution of the State of New York, as first Chancellor of the State, as the first Secretary of Foreign Affairs, and as Minister to France, where, by his skillful diplomacy, he obtained for the United States the rich province of Louisiana. At the same time he was perfecting his experiments in steam navigation, which his ability, perseverance, and large expenditure, aided by the practical suggestions of Fulton, gave to the world.

The life of the younger brother will be welcomed as an important addition to American biography. With the valuable material placed at his disposal, his biographer could scarcely fail to produce an interesting work; but he has succeeded in marshaling his facts in so clear a manner as to give a very vivid impression of a life singularly varied, and illumined by the broad lights of professional, judicial, and diplomatic eminence.

Edward Livingston was born at Clermont, Columbia County, New York, on the 26th of May, 1764. He was descended from an ancient family. One of the men of note in it was Sir Alexander Livingston, of Calander, who, on the death of James I. of Scotland, in 1737, was one of the regents of the kingdom during the ministry of James II. His son James became the first Lord Livingston. Alexander, the fifth lord, the ancestor of the New York Livingstons, was one of the two guardians of Mary, Queen of Scots; and his daughter, Mary Livingston, one of the four Marys maids of honor to the unfortunate Queen. His son, John Livingston, being slain at the battle of

Pinkiefield, in 1547, was succeeded by a son of Alexander, the first of three generations of ministers in the Scottish Church. The third of these ministers was John Livingston, a celebrated preacher, well-known in the annals of the kirk, by which he was appointed with another commissioner, and in conjunction with those commissioned by the Parliament, to proceed to Breda, to negotiate with Charles II. the terms of that king's admission to the throne of Scotland. He spent nine years in Rotterdam, being exiled for nonconformity. His son Robert, the founder of the Livingston family in the New World, here learned to speak the Dutch language, and on his emigration to America he went to Albany, then a village settled by the Dutch.

He bought large tracts of land from the Indians, comprising one hundred and sixty thousand acres, extending from the Hudson River to the Massachusetts line. The patent by which this land was incorporated into the manor of Livingston bears date 22d July, 1686. Thirteen thousand acres of this land were left by the first lord of the manor to his youngest son, Robert, (the grandfather of Edward Livingston,) who built a house at Clermont and always resided there. His only child, Robert R. Livingston, married Margaret, the only child of Col. Henry Beekman. They lived in the summer at Clermont, and in the winter in Queen-street, New York. A family of four sons and six daughters crowned this happy union. Edward Livingston speaks of "the harmony that united, and the gayety that inspired" them "under the auspices of that excellent mother who was never happy but when her children and her guests were so." His mother was a woman of stately presence, of deep piety, great benevolence, and remarkable intelligence. "Judge Livingston," says the biographer of his son Edward, "was a man worthy to transmit to his children the strong traits of their ancestors. He was a man of earnest piety, inflexible principle, genuine patriotism, and great gentleness of character."

Edward was the youngest, and the darling of the family. His eldest sister, Mrs. Montgomery, spoke of her love for him as "surpassing woman's love." The sweetness of temper so remarkable in his childhood continued with him, a priceless gift, throughout his long life. One solitary instance occurred

in the family history when one of his sisters complained of him to her mother, who at once said: "Go into the corner; I am sure you have been very naughty, or Edward would not have done so." Mrs. L., a niece of Edward Livingston, well remembers his mother saying that she had never seen him angry in her life; and his first wife, who was present, said that she could say the same thing.

When Edward was nine years of age his sister was married to Richard Montgomery, and his departure for his northern campaign made a deep impression on the boy of eleven, who has preserved the following touching reminiscence connected with it:

It was just before General Montgomery left for Canada. We were only three in his room: he, my sister, and myself. He was sitting in a musing attitude, between his wife, who, sad and silent, seemed to be reading the future, and myself, whose childish admiration was divided between the glittering uniform and the martial bearing of him who wore it, when all of a sudden the silence was broken by Montgomery's deep voice repeating the following lines, as one who was in a dream:

"'Tis a mad world, my masters:
I once thought so, now I know it."

The tone, the words, the circumstances, all overawed me, and I noiselessly retired. I have since reflected upon the bearing of this quotation, forcing itself, as it were, upon the young soldier at that moment. Perhaps he might have been contrasting the quiet and sweets of the life he held in his grasp with the tumults and perils of the camp, which he had resolved to seek without a glance at what he was leaving behind. These were the last words I heard from his lips, and I never saw him more.

These first shadows thrown over the boy's life deepened as the close of the year brought accumulated sorrow to the household at Clermont. In the short space of three weeks Edward lost his father, his Grandfather Beekman, and his brother-in-law, General Montgomery. The boy must have taken a heavy heart to his school in Albany. He was soon transferred to the care of his old friend and tutor, Dominie Doll, who had opened a school at Esopus, now Kingston. It was a remarkable proof of the sturdy good sense of the mother, that she should allow her petted boy to walk eighteen miles to his school on Monday morn-

ing and to return in the same way on Saturday. He always spoke of these weekly journeys with pleasure, ascribing to them that love of walking which contributed so much to his health and vigor throughout his life.

Another lesson learned at this time he used to refer to with great humor. Accustomed to the well-spread board at Clermont, he looked with dismay at the first dinner of pork and potatoes in the Esopus farm-house, where he had been sent to board. "I don't like pork; we never have it at home," was his answer when he was invited to partake of the frugal fare. "Very well, my little man," replied the host, "nobody obliges you to eat it." And so the little man had to content himself with a potato. The second dinner was a repetition of the first, but the boyish appetite was becoming urgent in its demands. "The third day fastidiousness succumbed to hunger, and a course of pork and potatoes, varied by nothing more refined, was entered upon and endured through the school term."

Esopus, then the third town in the colony, was honored by the deliberations of the first Convention of the Representatives of the State of New York, obliged to leave New York on account of the neighborhood of Lord Howe and his forces. Robert R. Livingston, the eldest brother of Edward, was a conspicuous member of this body, as well as of the "Secret Committee for facilitating the military operations on the Hudson," in which capacity he was the guest and the trusted adviser of Washington. His important labors in these two bodies prevented his affixing his name to the Declaration of Independence, though he had been selected by Congress, at the age of twenty-nine, to serve with Jefferson, Franklin, Sherman, and Adams in its preparation. The governor, legislature, and citizens were soon dislodged from Esopus by the approach of the British, who set fire to the town. Robert R. Livingston gave five thousand acres of land for the relief of the inhabitants of Kingston, whose homes were thus made desolate.

Edward returned to Clermont, but not to a tranquil home. Preparations were being made for leaving the house before the arrival of Vaughan and his command, who were lighting their way by the flames of towns and private dwellings. The boy was seeing something of war as the family, rudely driven from their burning home, found refuge in the town of Salisbury.

Pilgrimages have since been made to the stone house which sheltered them. There they remained nearly a year, when the retreat of the British having enabled Mrs. Livingston to rebuild the house, they were once more at home at Clermont.

Tumultuous as the times were, the young Edward was fitting himself for college. In 1779 he was entered a junior at Nassau Hall, Princeton. Dr. Witherspoon had just returned to call together the students, renew the library, and to restore the college buildings, which had been occupied by a detachment of the army of Cornwallis. After two years spent in Princeton, young Livingston was graduated, at the age of seventeen, with but five fellow-graduates.

On leaving college Edward Livingston began the study of the law in Albany, in the office of John Lansing, afterward second Chancellor of the State. After the evacuation of New York by the British, in 1783, he returned to the winter residence of the family, and continued his studies there until January, 1785, when he was admitted to practice as an attorney. The bar of the city then numbered but forty members, among whom were Robert Troup, Egbert Benson, Brockholst Livingston, Melancthon Smith, Aaron Burr, and Alexander Hamilton, to whom in a few years were added Josiah Ogden Hoffman and James Kent.

Edward Livingston arrived at eminence in his profession without the severe struggle with poverty and obscurity so usual in the history of great lawyers. He had large and influential family connections, and a home and an office in his mother's house, 51 Queen-street, part of the present Pearl, near Wall-street. Here he met the most brilliant society, the leading members of the New York bar, and foreigners of distinction, especially French gentlemen, welcomed as the friends and fellow-countrymen of Lafayette, and made at home in a family all of whom spoke their language fluently. The supper-table was always surrounded by guests, and earnest discussions of politics and literature were relieved by the lighter play of repartee and the most genial merriment.

The attractions of society were not permitted to interfere with the intense application necessary to success at the bar, and Edward Livingston, stimulated by the expectations his family had formed in regard to him, devoted himself to the

study of Roman law, while he did not neglect general literature and the Greek and Latin classics.

On the 10th of April, 1788, he married Mary, the daughter of Charles M'Evers, Esq., a tall, fine-looking woman of high principle and strong good sense.

In December, 1794, Edward Livingston was elected a member of the Fourth Congress of the United States, and as he was re-elected to the Congresses of 1796 and 1798, he was six years in the House.

In February, 1796, the young member introduced a measure which showed the bent of his mind toward the active philanthropy which so distinguished his subsequent career. It was a measure for the protection of American seamen who had been extensively impressed in the foreign and especially in the British service.

He spoke on the last day of the second session in support of a resolution requesting the President to interfere in behalf of Lafayette, then a prisoner at Olmutz. The remembrance of the noble friend of his boyhood gave eloquence and enthusiasm to the speech of the man; but the resolution was lost, and Washington's private entreaties failed to unlock the Austrian prison, whose doors were opened to the military arguments of Napoleon.

In the second session Mr. Livingston distinguished himself by his opposition to the alien and sedition laws, and produced a profound impression on the popular mind of the nation. Of this he had, years after, an amusing illustration. On one of his daily walks on the levee in New Orleans he was accosted by a man in a rustic dress, who asked him if he was Mr. Livingston, and then said: "I have come to ask you to lend me a doubloon." On being asked why he wanted that precise sum, he replied, "that less would not serve his purpose, and more he did not need." On receiving the coin he put it into his pocket, saying, "Good-night. If I live you shall hear from me again." Two years passed, and the circumstance was forgotten. Mr. Livingston was one morning sitting at breakfast with his family when a stranger was announced, who, walking straight up to the table, placed upon it a shining doubloon, saying: "I see you do not recognize me. I am the man you saved from ruin by lending me this amount two years ago. I owned a flat-

boat; it had been sunk with all its contents, and I was left penniless. I knew no one here, and had no means of getting back to Kentucky. I calculated that it would take just that amount to carry me home. Had I not been ill you would have seen me last year. But I am here now, and every thing has prospered with me since we met." On being asked what had led him to seek help from Mr. Livingston, he replied, "I cannot tell exactly, only I came from Livingston County, in Kentucky, which was named in honor of the author of the speech on the alien bill, and having had you pointed out to me as the same man, I thought I had more claim on you than on any body else."

Some resolutions which Mr. Livingston offered in the third Congress, with regard to the penal laws of the United States, show that the great subject which he elaborated in his famous code had already occupied his attention.

Edward Livingston's years had hitherto been passed in the sunshine of worldly prosperity. His middle life was clouded with perplexity and affliction. In 1800 his mother was suddenly taken away, and the next year his wife died of scarlet fever. He made the following record in his Bible :

On the 13th of March, 1801, it pleased Heaven to dissolve our union, which, for thirteen years, it had blessed with its own harmony, with an uninterrupted felicity rarely to be met with. Formed by mutual inclination in the spring of life, it was cemented by mutual esteem in its progress, and was terminated by a stroke, as sudden as it was afflictive.

While suffering the first anguish of this bereavement, he was appointed by Mr. Jefferson attorney of the United States for the district of New York, an honorable and lucrative office. About the same time he was appointed mayor by the council in Albany, then a post of great dignity and importance. The mayor in that day was required to give to the entertainment of strangers of distinction a degree of attention that became impossible in the subsequent rapid growth of the city. Mr. Livingston was eminently fitted to perform gracefully the duties of hospitality, and he kept open house at his residence, No. 1 Broadway, overlooking the Battery, now adorned with large trees planted under his direction. Amid multiplied duties, Mr. Livingston found time to set forth views in which

may be discovered the germ of the great scheme of philanthropy which was to make his name illustrious. At that early day he saw the necessity of those plans of discipline, reform, and active benevolence which have since found expansion in so many varied forms.

In a communication to the Mechanics' Society, he proposed that an organized attempt should be made by the society, jointly with the city government to found an establishment in which to assure the employment of first, strangers during the first month after their arrival; secondly, citizens who, from the effects of sickness or casualty, have lost their usual employment; thirdly, widows and orphans incapable of labor; and fourthly, discharged or pardoned convicts from the state-prison. This experiment would have required a capital and an organization which he thought the city government not prepared to undertake alone, but which he believed practicable as a joint undertaking of the government and the society which he addressed.

The mayor unfolded his scheme, of which the leading features were the opening of public workshops for the several branches of mechanical art, in which any tradesman wanting employment would be sure to get it in his proper trade, each shop to be managed under the direction of a committee appointed by the Mechanics' Society; a general office for the reception of applications by those destitute of employment as well as those requiring workmen; a large work-room, annexed to the almshouse, in which women and children might be employed in labors suited to their strength, where food might be prepared for them at a cheap rate, and where the children might receive the advantages of some education in the school belonging to the establishment; a system of regulations for the purchase of raw material, sale of manufactured goods, and price of labor, and the furnishing of the necessary capital by the corporation of the city.

The mayor's plans were in advance of the times, and the response of the society was a refusal to entertain them.

His claim as a philanthropist rests on better grounds than schemes, wise and far-reaching though they might be. On the 20th of July, 1803, the yellow fever made its appearance, and desolated the city with its fearful ravages. All who could leave fled from the pestilence. His biographer says:

The mayor calmly remained at his post, not limiting his exertions to the frigid performance of his official duty. On the contrary, he kept a list of the houses in which there were any sick, and visited them all, as well as the hospitals every day, ascertaining and supplying the indispensable needs of the poorest and most forsaken of the sufferers. He made every sick person in some sense his patient, and sought some share in the grief or joy of the families of victims or convalescents. He animated the zeal of his colleagues and subordinates in the government, stimulated the fidelity of nurses, physicians, and priests, and even went about the city at night to see for himself if the watchmen were thorough in their labors. In a word, it was the part of a Howard, in the person of a conscientious chief magistrate, that he enacted in this dreadfully real drama.

The fever began to abate before this true philanthropist was stricken with the contagion. The most enthusiastic popular regard was manifested. The choicest wines were sent when it was discovered that the last drop in his cellar had been given to the sufferers. His youngest sister watched him with the tenderest care, and his good constitution and sanguine will triumphed over the disease. Mr. Bancroft, in the graceful introduction to this interesting biography, writes:

Simple and frugal in his personal habits, he yet was overtaken by the severest calamity in his fortunes. Struck down by the yellow fever, caught from his visits of consolation and mercy to the sufferers among the poor during the raging of that disease in New York, he recovered from a desperate illness to find that he had been defrauded by a clerk, and that he was a debtor to the government beyond his means of immediate payment. Without a word of complaint, crimination, or excuse, he at once devoted his inheritance, his acquisitions, the fruits of his professional industry, to the discharge of his obligation to the government, and for near a score of years gave himself no rest till he had paid it, principal and interest without defalcation.

This sudden change in his fortunes shaped the subsequent career of Edward Livingston. He at once resigned both of his offices, arranged his affairs, conveyed all his property to a trustee for sale to cover his debt to the government, and leaving his children, from whom he had never been separated, to his brother, John R. Livingston, who had married Eliza McEvers, the sister of their mother, he embarked for New Orleans, with a hundred dollars in gold, and a letter of credit for at housand dollars more. Louisiana, "the mother of states," recently secured to the United States by the efforts of his

brother, seemed to offer to Edward Livingston the opportunity of retrieving his fortunes more speedily than at home. He received gratifying letters from Governor Clinton, a political opponent, and from the Common Council expressing their sympathy, their appreciation of his valuable services, and their wish that he should retain his office of mayor. Mr. Livingston was much gratified by a mark of esteem given him in after years by some of his fellow-citizens of New York. They made him an honorary member of the Society of Cincinnati, Andrew Jackson being the only other person on whom this honor was conferred.

Ready money was not plenty in New Orleans, but liberal payments in land rewarded the services of an advocate. His biographer says:

One of the earliest of these acquisitions was a property on the shore of the Mississippi, adjacent to the city, called the Batture St^e Marie, which alone—but for an unlooked-for and most untoward, as well as unjust and illegal opposition which he was destined to meet at the hands of his former friend, (Jefferson,) the President of the United States, whose election, when trembling in the balance, his vote and steady conduct had helped to decide, an opposition yielded in aid of local jealousy and temporary prejudice—would have made real, at an early day, his dream of independence.

After weary years this question was decided in his favor. Chancellor Kent wrote to him in 1814:

Permit me to assure you that I have sympathized with you throughout the whole of this controversy, as I took a very early impression that you was cruelly and shamefully persecuted, and that too by the executive authority of the United States. . . . When your reply came I read it eagerly and studied it thoroughly, with a re-examination of Jefferson as I went along; and I should now be as willing to subscribe my name to the validity of your title, and to the atrocious injustice you have received, as to any opinion contained in Johnson's Reports.

Mr. Livingston's temper proved itself perfect throughout this long controversy, and though keenly alive to the injustice which he received, no word of unkindness in private ever passed his lips.

On the 3d of June, 1805, Edward Livingston married Madame Louise Moreau de Lassy, the young and beautiful widow of a gentleman from Jamaica. Her history had been an event-

ful one. Her more immediate ancestors had emigrated from France to St. Domingo, where they lived in affluence till the revolution in that island. Mrs. Livingston sometimes in vivid narrative described the horrors of the night in which her father, two brothers, and her aged grandmother perished, and the narrow escape from massacre of her mother, her brother Auguste, afterward Major Davezac, her infant sister, afterward Mrs. Carlton, and herself, a widow of seventeen. They reached the United States by different vessels, and were afterward reunited at New Orleans. Mrs. Livingston combined with remarkable beauty great brilliancy and force of character. A daughter blessed Mr. Livingston's home in New Orleans, but he keenly felt the separation from his children at the north. Julia, who in beauty, grace, intelligence, accomplishments, and loveliness of character was all that the fondest father could desire, was growing into womanhood at two thousand miles distance. There was a delicacy of constitution which awakened his solicitude, and in the summer of 1813 his alarm. He left New Orleans the first opportunity, and after a long and tedious passage arrived in New York in October. The father, oppressed by anxiety, hastened to the house of his brother in Greenwich-street, and after hurriedly inquiring after the family from the servant who opened the door, asked, "How is Miss Livingston?" The servant, who did not know him, replied, "She was buried, sir, yesterday." The shock was a terrible one. The tender father staggered under the blow so peculiarly afflictive, and long retained the visible marks of this great sorrow.

A remarkable episode in the life of Mr. Livingston is the prominent part he took in General Jackson's celebrated campaign at New Orleans. Perceiving the danger afar off, he took active steps to arouse the people, delivered an eloquent speech at a meeting of citizens, and was appointed chairman of a committee of defense. In behalf of this committee he drew up an address to the people of the state, and corresponded with General Jackson, then at Mobile, furnishing him with maps and information. General Jackson's address, on his arrival at New Orleans, fell coldly on the ears of the citizens, many of whom did not understand English. Mr. Livingston rendered it into French, and it produced an electric effect.

On Sunday, the 18th of December, there was a most impos-

ing pageant in the public square, General Jackson reviewing all the troops in the city in the presence of the whole population. At its close, Mr. Livingston, standing near the commanding general, read, in tones that reached the hearts of the assembled multitude, an address that aroused the deepest enthusiasm, and was pronounced a masterpiece of eloquence.

When the fighting began Mr. Livingston served as volunteer aid, and his bravery in the night-battle was especially commended by Jackson.

The address, in the handwriting of Mr. Livingston, read by Jackson's orders to the army of defense, describes the stirring incidents of the campaign, and thus sums up its results:

And this glorious day terminated with the loss to the enemy of their Commander-in-chief, and one major-general killed, another major-general wounded, the most experienced and bravest of their officers, and more than three thousand men killed, wounded, and missing, while our ranks, my friends, were thinned only by the loss of six of our brave companions killed, and seven disabled by wounds. Wonderful interposition of Heaven! Unexampled event in the history of war! Let us be grateful to the God of battles, who has directed the arrows of indignation against our invaders, while he covered with his protecting shield the brave defenders of their country.

General Jackson, before leaving New Orleans, gave Mr. Livingston his miniature, painted on ivory, "as a mark of the sense" he entertained "of his public services, and a token of private friendship and esteem."

A most interesting chapter in the biography is devoted to Lewis Livingston, the beloved and only son of Edward Livingston. "From childhood's promising estate up to performing manhood," the fond father watched his progress, satisfied with the beautiful unfolding of so delicate and rich a nature, and most carefully suggesting the means of obtaining a ripe culture. In the campaign at New Orleans the youth, not then seventeen, was appointed assistant engineer with the rank of captain, and was commended by General Jackson "for talent and bravery." In the summer of 1818 he was commissioned by Governor De Witt Clinton to proceed to Quebec to superintend the removal of the remains of General Montgomery to New York, "a commission which he executed with perfect address and judgment."

At the end of this year, after a separation of three years and a half, Lewis rejoined his father in New Orleans. The joy of this meeting was soon clouded by an adverse decision given in the Batture case. "The dignified composure," writes Lewis to his aunt, "with which he listened to the judgment which blasted all his hopes, and stripped him of the fruits of fourteen years of hard and painful labor, drew tears from the eyes of all his friends, and struck with awe his bitterest enemies, even those who were instrumental in his ruin."

When Mr. Livingston returned from the court on that disastrous day he cut short the family comments on the subject by saying, "Come, let us say no more about it, and let us have the dinner served." During the dinner he was cheerful as usual, and afterward, taking his little daughter by the hand, he took his evening walk of an hour on the levee, talking to her about her lessons and upon other subjects that would interest her.

In 1820 Mr. Livingston accepted a seat in the Louisiana Legislature. In 1821, being anxious about his son's health, a voyage to France was resolved upon, and the young man sailed in April. He was warmly received by his father's friend, the Marquis de Marbois, and by Lafayette, and he wrote graceful letters to his father on the objects that engaged his attention. Foreign travel and medical advice, however, failed to restore his health, and in the autumn he wrote to his father that he had determined to return home. The letter reached the anxious father a few days before the arrival of the ship in which the son had embarked from Marseilles. Days of agonizing suspense, only to be ended by a terrible certainty! In the middle of January, 1822, the vessel arrived, and the father hastened to embrace his son, when he learned that he had died of a rapid consumption, and had been, the day after Christmas, buried by strangers' hands at sea. Thus rudely were broken the tender bands that had united father and daughter—father and son. In neither case was granted to him the melancholy satisfaction of parting words, or of seeing the beloved remains conveyed to their last resting-place. Years passed before Mr. Livingston could open the youth's writing-desk, and his name never afterward passed the father's lips.

Mr. Livingston always found occupation the best remedy for

distress of every kind, and it was well that at this time he was intensely occupied with the great work of his life, that which was to place his name with the philosophers and reformers of the world. In February, 1821, he was elected, by joint ballot of the General Assembly of Louisiana, to revise the entire system of criminal law of the state. To this task he addressed all his energies, eminently fitted as he was by his profound knowledge of Roman, English, French, and Spanish law, and of the languages in which they are written, by his judicial and professional experience, his varied culture, his knowledge of character, and especially of the people for whom the laws were designed. While he was earnestly engaged in the prosecution of his work he was elected representative from the first district of Louisiana to the Eighteenth Congress. When he left for Washington his task was nearly done, and during the first recess of Congress he devoted himself to its completion. It was at 66 Broadway, where he had taken lodgings with his family. His great work was done, the final corrections made, a fair copy had been prepared for the printer, and Mr. Livingston had spent the evening in comparing the papers, when an accident occurred which, in the sublime patience with which it was borne, may well be put by the side of Sir Isaac Newton's equanimity when his manuscripts too had been destroyed, and when he only said to his dog, the cause of their destruction, "Diamond, Diamond, thou little knowest the mischief thou hast done." Mr. Livingston tells the story in a letter to M. Du Ponceau, from whom he had borrowed a volume of Bacon's works:

The night before last I wrote you an apologetic letter, accounting for not having before that time thanked you for your letter and your book. My excuse lay before me in four codes of "Crimes and Punishments," of "Criminal Procedure," of "Prison Discipline," and of "Evidence." This was about one o'clock. I retired to rest, and in about three hours was waked by the cry of fire. It had broken out in my writing-room, and before it was discovered not a vestige of my work remained, except about fifty or sixty pages which were at the printer's, and a few very imperfect notes in another place. You may imagine, for you are an author, my dismay on perceiving the evidence of this calamity, for circumstanced as I am, it is a real one. My habits for some years past, however, have fortunately inured me to labor, and my whole life to disappointment and distress. I therefore bear it with more fortitude than I otherwise should, and instead of repining, work all

night, and correct the proof all day, to repair the loss and get the work ready by the time I had promised to the legislature.

This disaster did not disturb the calm serenity of Mr. Livingston's manner, and the night after he sat up until three o'clock in order to keep pace with the printer.

In two years more the code was completed, and, though the State of Louisiana never fully adopted it, its publication gave him a world-wide fame. Victor Hugo, the constant enemy of capital punishment, wrote to him: "You will be numbered among the men of this age who have deserved most and best of mankind." Villemain declared that this proposed system of penal law was "a work without example from the hand of any one man." Jeremy Bentham proposed that a measure should be introduced in Parliament to print the whole work for the use of the English nation. Taillander wrote: "The moment approaches when the Legislature of Louisiana will discuss the proposed codes prepared with so much care by Mr. Livingston. We hope that his principles will be adopted, and that state endowed with the noblest body of penal laws which any nation has hitherto possessed." Mr. Livingston received autograph letters on the subject from the Emperor of Russia and the King of Sweden, and a gold medal from the King of the Netherlands; while the government of Guatemala translated one of his codes, that of "Reform and Prison Discipline," and adopted it word for word, conferring, at the same time, the name of Livingston on a new city and district.

The leading features of this code were the total abolition of the penalty of death, and the proposal to enlarge the scope of penal legislation so as to embrace measures that would tend to preclude its commission. To this end the working of the system comprehended a house of detention, a penitentiary, a house of refuge and industry, and a school of reform, all under the superintendence and conduct of the board of inspectors. Mr. Livingston wrote beautiful letters to Sir Walter Scott, Fenimore Cooper, and Victor Hugo, endeavoring to gain the aid of their pens in reaching the popular mind, and influencing the public sentiment on the abolition of capital punishment. He also addressed most of the crowned heads of Europe on the subject.

After the lapse of nearly a quarter of a century Mr. Livingston was once more restored to the councils of the nation, and for six years kept his seat in the House of Representatives. He had been a member but four days when he introduced and succeeded in carrying into effect an important measure for the erection of light-houses, beacons, buoys, and floating lights along the track of navigation between New York and New Orleans; and he procured the erection of new and important Federal buildings at the latter place. At the same time he took a lively interest in public improvements, such as the great national road, and the project of a ship canal through the Isthmus of Panama to unite the two oceans.

Mr. Livingston became a senator of the United States from Louisiana on the same day that General Jackson entered on the presidency. His most elaborate speech was delivered on the 13th day of March, 1830, upon Foot's resolution raising the question of the true policy of the government with respect to the public lands, and embodied his views of the Constitution and the theory of the Federal Government. The following fine passage occurs in the conclusion of the speech, referring to the interior marble columns of the House, composed of variegated pebbles united by a natural calcareous cement:

What were they originally? Worthless heaps of unconnected sand and pebbles, washed apart by every wave, blown asunder by every wind. What are they now? Bound together by an indissoluble cement of nature, fashioned by the hand of skill, they are changed into lofty columns, the component parts and the support of a noble edifice, symbols of the union and strength on which alone our government can rest, solid within, polished without. Standing firm only by the rectitude of their position, they are emblems of what senators of the United States should be, and teach us that the slightest obliquity of position would prostrate the structure, and draw, with their own fall, that of all they support or protect in one mighty ruin.

General Jackson offered him the position of Minister to France, but he declined it, and Mr. Rives, of Virginia, was sent.

In March, 1831, Mr. Livingston retired to Montgomery Place, a beautiful estate on the banks of the Hudson, left to him by his sister, Mrs. Montgomery, who died in 1828. Here he expected soon to be joined by his wife and daughter, and in

their congenial society to spend the summer amid the trees and shrubs of Montgomery. At the age of sixty-eight he seemed to have earned by the intense labors of a long life a right to a season of repose. But a sudden summons to public life broke in upon this pleasing dream, and on the 24th of May he entered upon the important duties of Secretary of State. After he had been a month in the office he wrote a letter to his wife which he asked her to destroy:

Here I am in the second place in the United States—some say the first; in the place filled by Jefferson and Madison and Monroe, and by him who filled it before any of them, my brother; in the place gained by Clay at so great a sacrifice; in the very easy-chair of Adams; in the office which every politician looks to as the last step but one in the ladder of his ambition; in the very cell where the great magician, they say, brewed his spells. Here I am without an effort, uncontrolled by any engagements, unfettered by any promise to party or to man; here I am! and here I have been for a month. I now know what it is; am I happier than I was? The question is not easily answered. Had the bait never been thrown in my way; had I been suffered to finish the graft I had begun when your letter summoned me from the country; had I been permitted to stay and watch its growth until the fall, to wander all the summer through the walks you had planned, to see my daughter improving in health and spirits, now and then to plan a picnic, or plague myself in the vain attempt to catch a trout; to have exclaimed, on hearing what had happened here, "Among them be it," and taken the opinion of my two heads of department, Shoemaker on the crop of wheat, and Owen on the celery bed; could I have passed my summer thus, and taken my independent seat in the Senate during the winter, I could then have answered the question readily. But the temptation was thrown in my way; the prize for which so many were contending was offered to me; the acceptance of it was urged upon me: if I had rejected it, I think it would have been a source of regret that would have made me undervalue the real enjoyments for which I refused it—such is human nature.

Many of his state papers are models of style and of political wisdom. The able pen that had so faithfully served General Jackson performed for him perhaps its greatest service in the preparation of the celebrated Proclamation of the 10th of December, 1832, to the nullifiers of South Carolina. The original draught of this famous state paper still exists, "entirely in Livingston's handwriting, much amended by erasures and interlineations, according to his invariable habit, in all but his

epistolary communications." How descriptive of the madness of the present hour are his eloquent words, and how thrilling his appeal to those who thirty years ago stood on the brink of the precipice down which their successors have blindly plunged! His words were:

Contemplate the condition of that country of which you still form an important part. Consider its government, uniting in one bond of common interest and general protection so many different states, giving to all their inhabitants the proud title of American citizens, protecting their commerce, securing their literature and their arts, facilitating their intercommunication, defending their frontiers, and making their names respected in the remotest part of the earth. Consider the extent of its territory; its increasing and happy population; its advance in arts which render life agreeable; and the science which elevates the mind! See education spreading the lights of religion, morality, and general information into every cottage in the wide extent of our territories and states! Behold it as the asylum where the wretched and the oppressed find a refuge and support! **WE TOO ARE CITIZENS OF AMERICA!** Carolina is one of these proud states; her arms have defended, her best blood has cemented the happy Union! And then add, if you can, without horror and remorse, This happy Union we will dissolve; this picture of peace and prosperity we will deface; this free intercourse we will interrupt; those fertile fields we will deluge with blood; the protection of that glorious flag we renounce; the very name of Americans we discard. And for what, mistaken men—for what do you throw away these inestimable blessings? For what would you exchange your share in the advantages and honor of the Union? For the dream of separate independence—a dream interrupted by bloody conflicts with your neighbors, and a vile dependence on a foreign power. If your leaders could succeed in establishing a separation, what would be your situation? Are you united at home? are you free from the apprehension of civil discord, with all its fearful consequences? Do our neighboring republics, every day suffering some new revolution, or contending with some new insurrection—do they excite your envy? But the dictates of a high duty oblige me solemnly to announce that you cannot succeed. The laws of the United States must be executed. I have no discretionary power on the subject my duty is emphatically pronounced in the Constitution. Those who told you that you might peaceably prevent their execution deceived you; they could not have been deceived themselves. They know that a forcible opposition could alone prevent the execution of the laws; and they know that such opposition must be repelled. Their object is disunion; but be not deceived by names; disunion by armed force is **TREASON**. Are you really ready to incur its guilt? If you are, on the heads of the instigators of the act be the dreadful consequences, on their heads be the dishonor,

but on yours may fall the punishment. On your unhappy state will inevitably fall all the evils of the conflict you force upon the government of your country. It cannot accede to the mad project of disunion, of which you would be the first victims; its first magistrate cannot, if he would, avoid the performance of his duty. The consequence must be fearful for you, distressing to your fellow-citizens here, and to the friends of good government throughout the world. Its enemies have beheld our prosperity with a vexation they could not conceal; it was a standing refutation of their slavish doctrines, and they will point to our discord with the triumph of malignant joy. It is yet in your power to disappoint them. There is yet time to show that the descendants of the Pinckneys, the Sumters, the Rutledges, and of the thousand other names which adorn the pages of your revolutionary history, will not abandon that Union to support which so many of them fought and bled and died.

"In the spring of 1833," says his biographer, "he was chosen foreign associate of the Institute of France, (Academy of Moral and Political Science.) This distinction, which has always been sparingly conferred, which few Americans have reached, and which even monarchs can only attain through the double merit of genius and industry, he had not sought."

The spring of 1833 brought new changes. In April, Cora, the only surviving child of Mr. Livingston, was married to Thomas P. Barton, Esq., of Philadelphia, and immediately after the ceremony the President, in offering his congratulations, announced that Mr. Livingston was soon to go to France as Minister, and that he had selected Mr. Barton as Secretary of Legation. On the 29th of May Mr. Livingston resigned his office as senator, which he had held for two years, and on the same day he received his appointment as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to France. On the 14th of August he embarked, with his family, in the Delaware, ship of the line, and after a voyage of twenty-eight days, to which fine weather, excellent accommodations, and the agreeable society of the officers of the Delaware, gave the character of a party of pleasure, they arrived at Cherbourg.

He entered at once upon the duties of his mission, which was to obtain the payment of the large sum secured by treaty—the claim of the United States for indemnity on account of French spoliation under the Berlin and Milan Decrees, and the negotiation of a new treaty readjusting the commercial relations of the two countries. Mr. Livingston was received in a most

flattering manner by the king and the royal family, but the king apprehended, with good reason, a formidable resistance in the Chamber of Deputies. Six months elapsed before Mr. Livingston could obtain the definitive action of the Chamber on the subject, and that decision, by a majority of eight, was a refusal to make the appropriation. The President, in his annual message of December, 1834, recommended that the United States should take redress into their own hands, and that the Executive might be authorized to make reprisals upon French property, in case no provision should be made for payment of the debt at the then approaching session of the Chamber of Deputies. Intense feeling was aroused in France on the receipt of the contents of this message, and the Count de Rigney, Minister of Foreign Affairs, wrote to Mr. Livingston informing him that his majesty's government was preparing to present a bill for giving sanction to the treaty when the strange message of December came, and obliged it again to deliberate on what course it should pursue; that M. Serrurier would be ordered home from Washington.

Mr. Livingston's answer to the Count de Rigney was a spirited vindication of the President and his message, concluding with an appeal for the preservation of peace. He determined to await instructions from the President before he asked for his passports. The President was delighted with the letter to the Count de Rigney, which Mr. Van Buren said gave "the clearest, strongest, best-tempered views of the matter in controversy."

The official instructions of the President were, that if the appropriation should be rejected, he with all the legation should leave France in a United States ship of war; but if the appropriation should be made he should return to France or Belgium, leaving Mr. Barton as *Chargé d'Affaires*, and await further instructions. The bill passed on the 18th of April, with a proviso that the payment should not be made until the French government should have received satisfactory explanations of the terms used by the President in his annual message. Mr. Livingston, being thus left to his own judgment, resolved upon demanding his passports and coming home, leaving Mr. Barton in Paris as *Chargé d'Affaires*.

The frigate in which Mr. Livingston and his family were

brought home was commanded by Commodore Elliott, and arrived at New York the 23d of June. He was welcomed with popular enthusiasm, and he received repeated assurances of the satisfaction of the whole country, as well as of the President and Cabinet, with his course in the perplexing positions in which he had been placed in his mission to France.

Although past the threescore years and ten of human life, Mr. Livingston seemed just fitted in his green old age for the enjoyment of the quiet repose of Montgomery Place. With no public duties on his mind, he could indulge in the calm retrospect of a life well-spent, a laborious, useful life, devoted to high aims and great public interests. The over-worked man enjoyed with keen zest "the gorgeous fall foliage, listless sauntering, and nothing to do."

His clear intellect, his genial manners, his playful conversation gave his society an irresistible charm for his relatives, who had always esteemed him as an almost perfect specimen of humanity. One brother, John R. Livingston, and one sister, Mrs. Garrettson, were all that were left to him of that numerous band among whom his infant years were passed, and their homes were not far from his own. Clermont was at a short distance from Montgomery Place, and in this brief season of retirement his thoughts probably went back to the scenes of his boyhood as he reviewed his eventful life.

Once more he appeared in public life at Washington, in the Supreme Court, where he was engaged as senior counsel in the case of the Municipal Authorities of the city of New Orleans, appellants, *versus* the United States, respondents. Daniel Webster was his junior associate, while the other side was ably represented by Benjamin F. Butler, Attorney General of the United States. Mr. Butler cited largely from Mr. Livingston's pamphlet on the Batture case in terms of respect and approval that elicited from Mr. Livingston a digression most beautifully in place in his last public effort—most characteristic of the hour and the man. He said:

That pamphlet was written under circumstances in which the author thought he had suffered grievous wrongs—wrongs which he thought, and still thinks, justified the warmth of language in which some parts of his argument are couched, but which his respect for the public and private character of his opponent always

obliged him to regret that he had been forced to use. He is happy, however, to say that at a subsequent period the friendly intercourse with which prior to that breach he had been honored was renewed; that the offended party forgot the injury, and that the other performed the more difficult task (if the maxim of a celebrated French author is true) of forgiving the man upon whom he had inflicted it. The court, I hope, will excuse this personal digression; but I could not avoid using this occasion of making known that I have been spared the lasting regret of reflecting that Jefferson had descended to the grave with a feeling of ill-will toward me.

On his return from Washington he spent the rest of the winter in New York, and the early spring found him "among his buds at Montgomery Place," anticipating a summer of quiet happiness. On the night of Friday, the 20th of May, he was attacked suddenly and violently with bilious colic, and suffered the next two days with excruciating bodily pain. His aged sister, Mrs. Garrettson, then in her eighty-fifth year, was a welcome visitant by that bed of pain, as she spoke of those consolations and hopes that alone can give comfort to the dying. On Monday, the 23d of May, 1836, five days before the completion of his seventy-second year, he calmly breathed his last. And at Montgomery Place, now the residence of his daughter, Mrs. Barton, his widow, who had been the grace and ornament of his home in public life, spent nearly a quarter of a century in retirement, loving to dwell upon the beautiful character and public services of her honored husband. She was for many years a Methodist, and she died in 1860, in communion with the Church of her choice.

Mr. Livingston's death called forth "a powerful tribute of sorrow from the public mind." A good and great man had passed away full of years and honors. In answer to his mother's prayer for her youngest and darling child, the word came to her with power: "With long life will I satisfy him." She immediately added, "And show him thy salvation."

The "long life" with which he was "satisfied" is rich in lessons as well as results. One of these is, that the valuable prizes of the world are the reward of industry as well as of genius. Edward Livingston's life was one of laborious industry from the time, when a boy at Clermont, he pursued his studies amid the distractions and tumults of war, till he returned from his foreign mission in the ripe wisdom of his threescore and

ten years. No vacant spaces, no hours unemployed in that busy life in which, while he maintained in the most beautiful exercise the charities flowing from the relations of son, brother, husband, father, and friend, he took his place at the head of the bar in two cities; gained an enviable reputation on the floor of the House of Representatives and the Senate; sustained, with wonderful ability, satire, and eloquence, his part of a controversy which for years attracted the public attention; produced, as the fruit of four years of intense labor, a code, which has been stamped with the approval of the wisest and best of his countrymen, as well as of many of the leading statesmen of the world; wrote, as Secretary of State, the most masterly state-papers; and in the closing work of his life, amid the perplexities of foreign diplomacy, vindicated the national honor, and received the approbation of his countrymen.

In his character there was a rare union of simplicity and greatness. With all his wisdom and learning he was simple as a child, manifesting in high positions a genuine modesty singularly attractive in a man of acknowledged ability. He had a brave and hopeful spirit, serene and dominant in the darkest hour. When the family were giving expression to their bitter disappointments at the loss of the code, his little daughter, nestling in her father's arms, cried out, "It would have been better for me to be burned than the code." "Never mind, never mind, my daughter," he said, tenderly caressing her, "you shall see it rise like the phoenix from its ashes." No time was given to vain regrets. His work was in the living present. The next day his wife and daughter saw him come in from his early morning walk with a roll of paper, a bunch of quills, and a bottle of ink—materials just purchased to begin anew the work to which he had given his strength for two years, and to which he now addressed himself with unfaltering energy and perseverance.

The depth and tenderness of his character was manifested in the most beautiful manner in his conjugal and parental relations. His letters to his son would lead us to exclaim, "Blessed is the son of such a father, and the father of such a son." A gentleman of high position closed the book, after their perusal, with the expression of regret, never before so deeply felt, that his boyhood had known no such wise and loving care.

Such a life needs no eulogy. The mere record of its deeds places him who has done so great a part of the world's work among the benefactors of his race, and the story of this life, so well told, cannot fail to be read with interest and with pleasure.

ART. IV.—THE BATTLE OF BLENHEIM.

The Life and Times of Louis XIV. By G. P. R. JAMES. Two volumes. London: Henry G. Bohn. 1851.

Siècle de Louis XIV. Tome XX. Œuvres de Voltaire. A Paris: Firmin Didot Frères. 1830.

Memoirs of John, Duke of Marlborough: with his Original Correspondence collected from the Family Records at Blenheim, and other Authentic Sources. Illustrated with Portraits, Maps, and Military Plans. By WILLIAM COXE, F.R.S., F.S.A., Archdeacon of Wilts. Six volumes and Atlas. London: Longman. 1820.

The History of England from the Accession of James II. By THOMAS BABINGTON MACAULAY. Four volumes. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856.

BLENHEIM is one of the pivotal points in human history. On the morning of August 13, 1704, about this little village in the center of Europe gathered not merely Anglo-Austrian and Franco-Bavarian forces, but all the interests of humanity against all its perils. One system of government, philosophy, and religion was placed in the scale against another. And when we consider the advantage of position, strength, and prestige in favor of centralization and despotism in government, the most reckless skepticism in philosophy and subserviency in religion, against democratic principles, progression in philosophy, and reasonable faith in religion, we cannot but think that God put his heavy hand in the scale and turned it right for coming ages.

The works above named may help to understand the event and its relations. The first is a history of a French era by an Englishman—the history of Carthage by a Roman. The second the history of the same French era by a representative

Frenchman, the sovereign writer and author king of his century. Both were exuberant writers of fiction. In writing history they carry imagination among their facts. The first, seeking the dark and revolting elements of human character, induces us to suspect that he turns to historical studies to aid in his regular business of producing novels. The second, though searching for and often developing historical truth, arrays history with the splendors of a fancy which loves meretricious glory rather than humanity, and loves the gorgeous none the less because it is composed of the hues of imperial despotism, or borrows its brilliancy from the phosphorescent glimmer of moral and political corruption, or from the gleam of banners and bayonets and the blaze of burning cities.

For information on the other side, two historians have been chosen who are not surpassed for diligence of research, clear statement of conclusions, and accuracy of historic assertions. The first finds his hero great in all departments, ministerial, military, and financial, beyond the lot of many if not any other man. The second limns this so-called nations' benefactor and world's redeemer in colors dark, proportions uncouth, expression malign, springing from a soul most despicable. Not content with this, he seeks to fix suspicion of a woman's heaviest sin upon his wife, that she may be "fit body to fit head."

Our view of the importance of the event is indicated in the opening paragraph. A proper estimate of the men that acted in the drama is less important; for there is One that can use a Pharoah for the unification of his people, bringing a terrific pressure of severity to bear on individual elements and tribal strata, fused in affliction's furnace, producing an uncleavable granite unity that resists all conceivable disintegrating agencies. There is One that can deliver trembling armies by a shepherd's sling; that can give a Corsican lieutenant power to grasp a sheaf of scepters, and who can crush that power with snow-flakes. Remembering this, we never gauge men so much by the splendor of events in which they move, as by the lesser acts of cooler moments, showing the usual working of character under usual motives.

Previous to the battle of Blenheim there had been in government, philosophy, and religion a long preparation for man's harm, and an equally long preparation for man's good. The

interminable war between these two tendencies here reached a crisis. They had skirmished before. Here came their Waterloo. In the preparations for this conflict, centuries long, patiently made, guided by the best men, urged on by every possible energy of the worst, forwarded and retarded on either side by thousands that were aware or ignorant of the mighty interests at stake, centering at last the convergent armies of nations to a given point; in these preparations, so vast over countries so wide and ages so long, we may see the momentous importance of the impending fight.

Let us trace the separate and intrinsically different courses of government, philosophy, and religion previous to the time when they were pitted against each other in their decisive struggle.

The governmental policy of neither France nor England had been developed in any single reign. The forms they presented stood as the result of many sculptors, working at different times with different aims, and leaving the results with somewhat disproportionate parts. But while their parts differed from one another specifically, the forms differed generically.

The general dissolution of all authority and law that followed the death of Charlemagne brought into supremacy that primal law of human nature, every man for himself. In the confusion that followed the weak were glad to put themselves under the strong, even to the extent of abject servitude; for if they were oppressed they were protected from utter ruin. Even misers seldom think it best to slay the bird laying golden eggs for the dubious prospect of a mine. The feudal system culminated, declined, and produced the worst effects possible for any system of selfish power, divided into innumerable factions, each hostile to each, with elements of discord in every petty fief of a dozen acres, with the most unmitigable slavery of equal races, till, in the weakness of the nation, English invaders, barbarian superstition, and popish bigotry rendered the two and a half centuries of the Valois kings, ending in 1589, most lamentably disastrous to every interest of the French nation.

The law of physics, that carries the pendulum as far beyond the center as it had previously been drawn on the hither side, holds good in philosophy, religion, and government. Segregation had failed, aggregation must follow. Petty fiefs must give

way to colossal empire. Here was the auspicious moment to balance prerogative and privilege. Wise men saw the propitious hour. The states-general was convoked in the time of John of Valois. This assembly and the tumultuous multitude sought to gain some chartered rights, as the barons, a century and a half before, did from John of England. Alas, that they lacked the indomitable perseverance to achieve them! In this constitutional crisis of France despotism triumphed. But the spirit of liberty is immortal. It renewed its contest with prerogative in succeeding reigns, always defeated, till Charles VII., made conqueror by the immortal frenzy of Joan d'Arc in the hour of victory and uncautions thanksgiving, stole from France its last safeguard of constitutional freedom. He established an army, maintained by a perpetual tax, irrespective of any legislative assembly. This army, thus maintained, was all that tyranny could ask. Liberty called for arms. A war for the public good, as it was called, followed in the reign of Louis XI. Proving victor, he found fresh occasion for the further restriction of liberty, and greater exercise of despotic power. Here ends the constitutional struggle. A few words on the development of the system.

Reacting from feudalism, the ruling policy of the sixteenth century was to enlarge the national territory, irrespective of natural boundaries, affinities of peoples, or commercial relations. Charles VIII., Louis XII., Francis I., and Henry II., all descended into Italy. Charles V., of Germany and Spain, and Philip II., were not slow to follow such illustrious examples. Poor unhappy Italy, first leaguering herself with one and then the other, shifting desperately to make her two enemies fight each other, spoiled by both, reaped, both in property and character, all the degrading results of duplicity and intrigue. Meanwhile for this great end of foreign spoil every resource of internal advantage was neglected. The increase of population went to renew armies, the produce of the arts to sustain them. The spirit of the people was made warlike, military fame the only proper ambition. Every interest of the people was neglected, every possible tax imposed, and every interest of the country misdirected or repressed. For empires of heterogeneous masses must be agglomerated, despite the depopulation and waste of the original kingdom by the effort of conquest and the imi-

nent peril of civil war among elements so admirably adapted to that end.

This very result, civil war, followed. Always most fierce and sanguinary, this was intensified in horror by being fired with religious fanaticism, till on a given signal, by the connivance and active participation of all the nobles, priests, and best men of the kingdom, seventy thousand were murdered; neighbors, friends, relatives murdered without the maddening strife of war! Sanctioned by public authority, urged by the chief men of the nation, defended from Rome, approved by the priests as acceptable to heaven, this horrid holocaust was offered, not in expiation of previous crime, but an evidence of deep, damning depravity beyond name. Even when this was done, unshocked by the crime, the Romish clergy formed a league for the utter extirpation of the Protestants and the management of the king. Meanwhile the blazing *auto de fés* of Philip II. in Spain, and the thirty years' religious war in Germany, gave small assurance of better things for man in Europe. The close of these wars in France brings us within two monarchs, or sixty years of Louis XIV. How much improvement was made under these Bourbon kings we will now examine.

Henry IV., the first of the house of Bourbon, was a Protestant. But let us not suspect that religious names had any relation to religion. Married to a Catholic seven days before the massacre of St. Bartholomew, he saved his life by apostasy from his nominal faith. He came to the throne by the murder of the Duke of Guise and Henry III., and by the second abjuration of Protestantism; established himself by years of internal war, passed his life in the grossest licentiousness, a slave to the passion for gambling, and died by the dagger of Ravaillac.

That the internal condition of France could improve under such a monarch shows the desperate state of her previous fortunes. But while agriculture was developed, commerce and art encouraged, and toleration promulgated by the edict of Nantes, no permanent good, no security for the rights of men, no bulwark against future tyranny or amelioration of the present, no advance in the constitution of the kingdom was achieved. The only item in the Constitution that had any relation to preserving the rights of men was that Parliament held the right to *register* the edicts of the king. How ready these supple bodies

were to do the king's pleasure may be seen by the following characterization of them from the *Henriade* of Voltaire: "Inefficient assemblies, where laws were proposed rather than executed, and where abuses were detailed with eloquence, but not remedied."

Things went from bad to worse under Louis XIII., who, after a childless marriage of twenty-two years, having been reconciled to his hated queen by her deception, became the father of Louis XIV.

Louis XIV. announced his whole policy in a single line, *L'état c'est moi*, a sentiment adjudged blasphemous by all the sacred laws of civil society. His reign was splendid, but it was with that splendor peculiarly appreciable in France, foreign conquest and elegant debauchery. For the first the state of Europe was peculiarly favorable; for the second there never was any lack of opportunity or disposition in France. Charles II. of England was bribed, and made to declare war against his tried allies. Spain was weakened by dissensions among her widely-scattered, ill-compacted kingdoms; Germany torn by civil wars; Holland wasted by attempts to conquer Brazil, and at the same time consumed as to her vitals by internal strife. Then the great central power of Louis XIV. was wielded against the broken nationalities, and towns, fortresses, principalities were gathered as a reaper gathers grain. But as time passed on things changed in England, and when there was no power on the continent that could stay the vaulting ambition of the French monarch, the islands of the sea put themselves in his path, to vindicate the interests of man or be crushed by the colossal Juggernaut of power.

Much as Louis had succeeded for himself and France, he had made nothing secure. No constitutional bulwark restricted the unbounded abuse of power by himself or any succeeding king. No *habeas corpus* act existed. No trial by jury was guaranteed. France was not a monarchy tempered by a constitution and legislative assemblies. It was a despotism that could be tempered only by revolution and assassination. No tide of influence could flood up from the ruled to the ruler, except when the last fiber of endurance snapped seas of human beings surged round the uncaring author of their woes, either to be trampled down by armies or ruined afresh by revolution. That

government that takes away responsibility from the ruled is destructive of the best powers of man: powers that can be developed only in those whom God made to be responsible agents. When man has none of the rights of man committed to his care his soul narrows to the grasping, withering care of self. Better be a peasant in a republic than a courtier under despotism.

The social state of the kingdom was loathsome. The king had many children by his wife, more by his mistresses, Montespan alone bearing him six. Nations change their policy by some imminent foreign danger or evident domestic advantage. Louis changed his when he changed mistresses, and by their friends whom they brought into power. So that when the royal favor meant crime, and in any proper society would have meant infamy, it was eagerly sought by ladies of high rank; for, obtaining it, they obtained not the dalliance of the monarch's leisure hours alone, but some control of the nation's destinies. Masterly statesmen eagerly urged the prostitution of near female relatives, that by their shame, then accounted honor, they might gather influence and reins of power. Whoever sees the fruits of these things in the succeeding reign will thank God that the destinies of the race were not longer periled by the unchecked prevalence of such a system of government.

Turn now to the preparations for man's good in the department of government. The nation that chiefly contended that fateful field of Blenheim against France had a far different training, arrived at a far different result. Commencing in a union of different races, in itself almost a pledge of success, it abolished the domination of one race over another, and quickly added the abolition of the right of man to property in man. From her earliest history three unbreachable barriers have been held against the encroachments of kingly power. The fight over these has been desperate at times. Some tyrants have forced a momentary passage, only to receive terrible punishment for their headlong temerity. This triple line of defenses kept human rights secure, namely, the king could not legislate without consent of Parliament; could not tax the people without the action of their representatives, and was bound to conduct his executive in conformity with the laws on peril of his throne or head.

All the limited monarchies of the continent became absolute in the middle ages because of the seeming necessity of standing armies. These must be wielded by the king, and hence he becomes independent. The insular position of England saved her the necessity of such an army, until the people had learned that they held over the king a power greater than he over them. For if he held power, they held its origin and continuance, the purse.

In 1215 that charter of the rights of the governed, then and in all ages deservedly called Great, was obtained. At that early time human rights were made more sacred in England than they have become in many other monarchies even yet. Not that England obtained in the thirteenth century a perfect constitution, but from such splendid beginnings she has maintained freedom, liberty, and a measure of equal justice to an extent unknown in any other country. Freedom of speech obtained in spite of the efforts of Henry IV. and Elizabeth to prevent it. After many hard contests, productive of mutual respect, England and Scotland united their fortunes, to the obvious advantage of both. King Charles I. attempted to wring from the people their ancient chartered rights, but had speedily wrung from him the enlargement and reiteration of that charter. Disregarding this, the Long Parliament, having first put its own existence beyond the pleasure or displeasure of the king, enacted that a Parliament should assemble every three years, at the king's call or without it. It abolished his inquisitions, called Star Chamber and High Commission; impeached and imprisoned his ministers, righted wrongs with a vigorous hand, and when the king proved hypocritical, treacherous, and tyrannous, removed the trouble by removing his head. The unequalled grandeur of the act lies in the fact that it was done by law, and not by revolution or murder. Popular right surpassed kingly might.

Then arose the Commonwealth, in which every right was safe at home, and those of distant unknown peoples extorted from unwilling hands.

Proverbially untractable as kings are, Charles II. and James II. sought to do the very things that had cost the life of the father of the one and was about to cost the crown of the other. Revolution followed, and William of Orange, fresh from the

Dutch Republic, gathered up the reins of power that these self-sufficient Phaëthons proved incompetent to hold, and the blazing chariot of civil and religious liberty wheeled once more to its beneficent path. A Bill of Rights, that completely renovated the abused constitution of the realm, was enacted. Toleration was promulgated. A bill was framed to keep the legislature pure, by incapacitating its members from holding any office as a bribe from the crown. Slightly modified, it passed in the reign of his successor. Venal parliaments had been able to sit interminably. Hence a new triennial bill returned them to the people every three years. Treason was defined. No man could be indicted but on the oath of at least two witnesses. A copy of the indictment must be furnished the accused, also a list of his jury, counsel for his defense, and power to summon witnesses. No wonder Vattel, looking from his land over the channel, exclaimed, (*Law of Nations*, p. 63,) "Happy constitution! which they did not suddenly obtain. It has cost rivers of blood, but they have not purchased it too dear!"

Thus England went to war, not for chimerical ideas and Utopian schemes, but for rights guaranteed to all her subjects. In her crown glittered all the stars that had been symbols of hope; in her hand gleamed the judicial sword, wielded by all the strength justice and hope could give. She took her place beside the Dutch Republic, an old enemy of tyranny that for a hundred and fifty years had waged the dubious fight. Weak and alone, she had not stopped to measure the strength of the empire of Philip II.; she opposed it. Girt with the strength of right, and fired with the impulses of freedom, the unknown province became the first power of Europe, and the shattered empire was content to receive peace at her dictation.

The Dutch Republic was an organized protest against ecclesiastical tyranny and universal dominion. It took its very beginning when the empire of Charles V. had swallowed up every vestige of human freedom. It was man's only champion in the sixteenth century. England stood by her in the seventeenth. Descendants from both took the championship in America in the eighteenth. Good cause had Holland to oppose Louis XIV. Provinces, states, fortresses, and cities had been seized by his resistless hand. She battled for existence, and in

contending for her own secured the well-being of man. She gave England one of her wisest kings; and united in blood, fortune, and interest, both went forth to battle. Thus the two systems of government were opposed, every interest of man against his every peril.

Let us turn a moment to view the position of

PHILOSOPHY.

All ideas properly belong to the province of philosophy; but having taken out the departments of government and religion for separate treatment, all else relative to the subject remains for present consideration. We cannot minutely follow all the systems of metaphysical speculation. Being as often results as causes, as often growing out of popular tendencies as creating them, in the one case indices of what national thought has been, and in the other of what it will be, in either case their general principles will clearly indicate national tendencies.

At the mention of philosophy who does not think of Bacon, who uttered the first protest against the fetters of the Aristotelian philosophy. Men turned at his bidding from hypotheses to facts, from trimming things to theories, to conforming theories to actual verities. His whole work means independence. He sounded a trumpet for a charge on the realms of darkness. Thousands in every land sprang up armed with his weapons, and according to his methods made wide conquests in the realm of ignorance and old night. Well says Burke: "Who is there that upon hearing the name of Lord Bacon does not instantly think of everything of genius the most profound, everything in literature the most extensive, everything in discovery the most penetrating, everything of observation on human life the most distinguished and refined?" Whom does France offer as his equal? Even La Place, a hundred and fifty years later, could only follow Newton, and say his *Principia* held pre-eminence over all other productions of the human mind. With Bacon and Newton, England scarce need fear superiority in physical science. Turning to psychology, we are confronted by Locke. His philosophy was imperfect rather than wrong. The wrong has been in the carrying out, which it received at the hands of others. Conclusions drawn, by the sensual school, from his not properly defined premises, were

distinctly repudiated by him. The remark of Cousin is significant: "It was necessary that the philosophy of Locke should pass the channel in order to meet with success." What harm there was in Locke took little root in England. The soil was not congenial. It blew over the channel and sprang into luxuriant growth. The whole sensual school, led by Condillac, Cabanis, De Tracy, Volney, and last, Broussais, the reviver of the first, caught its inspiration from Locke. To resolve everything into mere sensation was the object of Condillac's later and most finished work, *Le Traité des Sensations*. The whole contest in France, from the time of Louis XIV., when the Cartesian philosophy rapidly gave way, till the appearance of Kant, was to get the worst out of the prevailing Lockian philosophy. The whole contest in England, was to get the best. Scotland put in a protest against materialism, and in seeking to defend Locke against the imputation of it, only showed him to be inconsistent. On the one hand, the good of the system was adhered to and its errors ignored; on the other, the errors only adopted and greatly increased.

Though France had taken the universal doubt, that is, the alpha of Des Cartes' system, she followed not his "method" for the discovery of truth, was much more in sympathy with the development of his errors in the subtle pantheism of Malebranche, or the open fatalism of Spinoza. The tendencies of the French mind culminated in the atheism of Voltaire, the encyclopedic writers, and in revolution. Those of the English in common sense and reformation.

Freedom of the press deserves consideration. Intelligence and liberty spread or dwindle as this is allowed or restricted. The first step is to appoint a licenser; the next to allow perfect freedom of publishing, a general law declaring what is prejudicial to the morals of the state. The system is perfected when conviction is put in the hands of a jury, the amount of punishment in the hands of the judges. England early advanced near this ultimatum. France never yet got beyond the first step, which means freedom of the press to the extent of the caprice of the licenser, or the option of the tyrant appointing him.

A glance at the literature produced by the two countries shows the enormous potency of this single principle. It shall be sufficient to mention names previous to 1704. Shakspeare,

Bacon, the Johnsons, Jeremy Taylor, Milton, Bunyan, Locke, Swift, Addison, Newton. Who shall be named on the other side their equals? Both national taste and government patronage encouraged dramatic productions. Is there a French Shakspeare? Shut out from politics, the mind rushes more eagerly into literature. Has France an Addison? The whole animus of government and religion was against the highest mental culture. Yet the age of Louis XIV. is called the Augustan age. The comparison is truer than it seems. In the age of Augustus, Horace, Ovid, Catullus, all contemptibly sycophantic and sensual, some beastial and infamous, were in highest favor at court. Such elegant triflers were most welcome at the court of Louis XIV. In the Augustan age Cicero was banished and assassinated. So, in the parallel, Pascal was persecuted, Madame Guyon arrested, Fenelon and Quesnel exiled. The religion of the state had thoroughly established its modern system of crushing out human thought. From being the preserver of letters in the dark ages, the Romish Church since the time of Galileo, in 1633, has bent its every energy to dwarf and crush the intellect of man. Having subserviency for its central point of doctrine, taught by Luther the terrible results of free inquiry, every possible appliance must be made use of to crush free and enlarged thought. The character of the Church may be best understood, its history best read from this stand-point. Its fearful success in this respect is the darkest page of history.

It is usual to speak much of the darkness and ignorance of England in the seventeenth century. This appears excessive, partly by a just view of the real darkness of the time, and partly by contrast with the glorious light of religious reformation that followed. But dark as England was, it was very different from the darkness it opposed. There were lights in its darkness. Stars flashing in its sky. The lights in the darkness it opposed might be compared to these same stars reflected in the bosom of a putrid pool. England had real stars; morning stars; heralds of a dawn that tarried not. And when the day burst and the sun appeared, those pools that had seemed to burn with holy light were clearly seen, loathsome, miasmatic, deadly.

Holland, the opposer of Louis XIV. and ally of England,

also had a most noticeable development of mind. The Republic, preserving inviolable the liberty of the press, the right of assembly and petition, and engaging every citizen in the conduct of public affairs, had done a republic's work in quickening, freeing, and enlarging mind. The words and sufferings of Grotius did not vindicate toleration in vain. Arminianism, which has always been allied with liberty, was defined by Episcopius at the Synod of Dort, 1618. The tenet of free-will does as much to dignify and free the human mind as that of necessity degrades and enslaves it.

With such achievements and tendencies for good and ill, philosophy saw with anxiety that contest that was to determine the prowess and reign of its different supporters.

RELIGION.

To comprehend the religious interests that were at stake in this battle, it will be necessary to glance at the history and define the actual position of the Romish and Protestant Churches. The beginning of the seventeenth century is distinguished for a remarkable outspread and triumph of the Romish Church. By vast colonies and conquests by Romish countries, by unusually successful missions, and a quiet strengthening of the central power, it seemed about to grasp the universal supremacy it sought. But the growth of intelligence, the spirit of liberty, and the wane of religious impulse, resulting in a successful thirty-years war for Protestantism in Germany, brought a check on its success.

Just at this point, Pope Urban VIII. sought to stay the decline of the Church by perfecting its temporal policy, and adding new political states to the papal crown. But fierce political wrangling for spoils brought little strength or unity of purpose to the Church. Popes succeeded each other with a rapidity that suggests those temporal sovereignties that are tempered by assassination. These shepherds wore ovine names—Clement, Innocent, etc.—but they covered lupine natures. Pasquin might have said of such shepherds, "Sometimes they feed the sheep, often they shear them, always make mutton of them." Contrary to Scripture, they warred with principalities and powers, and not against wickedness in high places. And if their weapons were spiritual, they were of the

kind described by Milton, when there was war in heaven. Clement IX., of whose excellence every one speaks, distributed to his electors \$600,000, said to be previously agreed upon. No wonder papal debts got so heavy. Well said Casimir Delavigne, "*Les sept péchés mortels ont porté la tiare.*"

About the middle of the seventeenth century, the whole character of the Jesuit order was changed. From ascetic monks they became prime ministers. From feeding beggars they began to confess princes. Their tenets also changed, so that sin was almost an impossibility. "The yoke of Christ," said one, "has become marvelously easy."

Just about this time Cornelius Jansè, afterward known as Jansenius, undertook a reform as elevating as the other was corrupting; as pure as the other was base. Well-nigh right in doctrine, quite right in practice, exalting the grace of God, abating the preposterous values assumed for works, imbued with the spirit of the Scriptures, he differed from Luther chiefly in this, that he regarded the Bible *and* the early fathers as giving the ground of practice and faith. Together with St. Cyran, the literary academy of Port Royal was established, where the Scriptures were translated, school books produced, and holy thoughts, from such minds as Pascal's, prepared for the whole people.

Popery must choose between these two rival sects. It did not take long. Rome quickly and infallibly perceived its affinities. The whole weight of the Church, wielded by Richelieu, was hurled against the Jansenists, then the only hope of the papal Church. Infallibility declared certain heresies to be taught by Jansenius's works. All his followers declared the contrary. But infallibility cannot argue, so the whole principle of toleration must be put down. Hence the rights granted to Protestants by the edict of Nantes were revoked, (1685,) and half a million of prosperous citizens of France exposed to the rapacity and violence of the Catholic soldiery: an act of perfidy impossible to Punic faith, comparatively easy for a Church capable of a general massacre of dissenters. Louis XIV. broke through every law, human and divine, to perpetrate this enormous crime, for the purpose of appeasing the head of the Church of Rome, who had contended fiercely with him, not for the amelioration of excessive taxes, not for lenity in arbi-

trary and life-long imprisonments, not for any appearance of decency in the court of him who called himself "most Christian," but for the revenues of certain sees. The savage brings bloody scalps to please his brutal mistress; fires of persecution and most outrageous murder appropriately appear to placate his offended holiness. This was the condition and character of the Church seeking universal supremacy under the banners of all-victorious Louis XIV. If such be religion, how blessed it must be to be wicked!

Let us compare the history and position of Protestantism. From the days of Luther it had contended for a legal right to live. This it obtained, by force of arms wielded by the Smalkeldic League, at the peace of Passau, 1555. This was the first point gained in the contest for the right to think. Alas! so long trained to contention, Lutherans and Zwinglians could not tolerate each other. Favored by Maximilian II., severely tried by Rudolph II. and Matthias, Protestantism staked its every interest on the valor and wisdom of the Elector Palatine. In vain; the cause and occasion surpassed the man. Then Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden, with a few thousand men, confronted the colossal Austrian power. Minor states rallied to his banner. The many weak opposed the one strong. But though Gustavus left his mangled body on the field of Lützen, the cause survived, and by the treaty of Westphalia, 1648, Protestants became equal before the law. Liberty of conscience was secured; the many little Protestant states escaped being swallowed up by Catholic Austria; and, best of all, the Protestant sects learned that they had a common cause. Together they wielded their arms at Blenheim against another threatening annihilation.

Space forbids our tracing the history of religion in the chief Protestant power that risked so much in that battle. There are dark pages in its history, as well as light. But Protestant intolerance, imprisonment, and infliction of death, only show the kind of education men had received from the papal Church. The bitterness of animosity, the length of its continuance, show how thoroughly the lesson had been taught. But already the chief faults of the Church were behind her. Every year she was more free from the savage brutality and crushing bigotry that men had put into God's religion. As surely as the Roman

Church had in it seeds of death, producing a constant increase of a hundredfold, so surely had the opposing Church seeds of life for itself and all the world. For with all its faults, Protestantism held aloft an open Bible. The fountain of divine life and light was free for all. The stultifying assumptions of human infallibility were spurned. The unshackled mind leaped upward. No wonder if it leaped somewhat wildly. Every possible good for man lay in that open Bible. It was the one book of England and Scotland; it made iron men for the armies of the Commonwealth; it created the leaders of thought and action for coming time. This same regenerating word of God had free course in Holland and Germany. All its fruits Romanism opposed; with what energy is indicated in a remark of Pius V., that all the property of the Church, crosses and chalices not excepted, should be used in an expedition against England. Romanism opposed free government, general intelligence, right to think, progress in liberal arts, the free course of God's word, and Christ's reign; offering instead despotism without mitigation, fetters for the intellect, a Bible chained, a morality most loathsome, a surveillance unceasing, punishments most severe, death for attempted reforms, and the reign of the devil as the vicegerent of Christ.

Now comes the conflict. There, at the east, on that rising ground beyond the river Nebel, are sixty-five thousand men. Away to the south the village and marsh of Lutzingen makes strong their left flank. Palisades and intrenchments make strong the line. Away to the north the masonry houses of Blenheim are filled with the soldiers of their right flank. Here are fifty-two thousand men; they must go down this broken and difficult descent, through the river, up that ascent of ground; must force those intrenchments, take those cannon, scatter those superior numbers. Fearful odds against the attacking party.

But God's interests are at stake. Let us invoke his aid. It is done, by command of the chief, at the head of every regiment. Forward! — We cannot trace the difficult progress; the thrice repeated repulse; enough that complete success at length crowned the arms of freedom and religion.

Theirs was no barren victory. It is not to be accounted complete because of standards, cannon, or other trophies taken,

nor because of that great army not twenty thousand could ever be gathered again; but because the vast despotic schemes of Louis were foiled; because England could enjoy and propagate her liberal constitution; because American colonies were not brought under the yoke that was being put on Europe; because Holland could still be free: and when England forgot her duty in 1775, Holland was able to render essential aid to the American cause.

The further spread of French literature and theories of social science by the fostering patronage of despotic power was hereby checked, and better thought, truer science, and purer morals were helped by the prestige of the dominant power.

In religion the effect was no less evident. Almost immediately after the battle three of the five great powers that determined the policy of Europe were anti-Papal. As soon as 1709 the papal see lost its umpireship among the Catholic powers. By the peace of Utrecht, Sicily and Sardinia, fiefs of the papal crown, were assigned to other sovereignties without the pope being even consulted. Soon after, in his immediate neighborhood, the temporal power of the pope was annihilated. In 1799 the pope's very palace was plundered, his ring torn from his hand, food and clothes denied him, and he himself led away to prison in contempt, with scarce a friend on earth to strike a blow for his deliverance, or utter a protest against his wrongs. Antichrist fell nine days from his attempted usurpation of heaven to his place in hell. Popery fell a century from its usurped height of religious and political power, to a depth from which there is no reascension.

Protestantism found itself the leading moral and political power. The world's commerce was coming into its hands. The world's riches were pouring into its lap. One who was mastering the rudiments of walking at the time of the battle of Blenheim, afterward carried the banner of free grace and a pure life over myriads of miles. The reformation of England under Wesley was the result. The reformation of the world by his doctrine is yet to follow.

Let none despair of the triumph of God's cause. In the time of its darkness he shines forth; in the time of its weakness his arm is not shortened. Though men despaired of the world's conversion when government, philosophy, and even religion

opposed it, and hence interpreted the Scriptures in favor of a personal reign of Christ, they should now take heart, put greater trust in God, and, with government, philosophy, and religion as allies, declare that the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ.

ART. V.—THE NICODEMITES OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

PERIODS of great civil commotion are wont to develop at least three classes of characters, each easily distinguished from the others. On the one hand are seen the lovers of novelty or friends of reform, whose motives are not always above the suspicion, whether just or otherwise, that they are not less influenced by their restless instability than by a desire to ameliorate the condition of their fellow-men. On the other, stand the avowed opponents of change, whom native temperament or interest, or both, render averse to any alteration in the existing *regime*: lovers of order, they style themselves; but with them order is a cold, lifeless thing, which denies the possibility or expediency of attempting to introduce any improvement, while it tolerates the slow but sure progress of that degeneration which is innate in every corrupt system. And between the two there is a large and intelligent class of persons who, while they sympathize completely with neither of the extremes, see much that is excellent in each. The veneration for antiquity professed by one side, and the necessity of reform which is the pass-word of the other, are both accepted; and thus these moderates might be mistaken for adherents of either dogma, but for the fact that they neither believe that ancient abuses ought to be maintained at any risk, nor that reforms ought to be purchased at any cost.

As it is in civil, so is it also in those great religious movements, which, if they produce a less immediate and sensible effect upon the external constitution of human society, are far more lasting in their results, and tend ultimately to renovate

the face of the world. The force of conviction operating upon natures originally frank, impulsive, and more inclined to weigh truth than to calculate probabilities of failure, gives rise to examples of rare enthusiastic devotion to what is believed to be the cause of God, of true religion, and of the enfranchisement of the human intellect and heart. These are the men who venture single-handed, or supported only by such auxiliaries as their eloquent appeals have gathered around them, to attack the time-hallowed systems of error which have usurped the places once occupied by truth. They are confronted with a scarcely less determined resolve by those who can conceive of no proof of doctrinal orthodoxy so strong as that derived from prescription, nor any test of heterodoxy more convincing than its opposition to the commonly received notions of the men of past centuries. From the eyes of the men of this latter class the ivy of antiquity, with its dense mantle of green foliage, quite conceals the rents and fissures which run through the old tower in every direction, and threaten to change at any moment that which is so graceful in its proportions into an unsightly ruin. Here again a third party takes a middle ground. While conceding that there is but too much of truth in the pictures which are drawn of the corruptions of the Church and its institutions, and that the need of reform is imperative, and perhaps at first making common cause with the more thoroughly convinced reformers, they are soon appalled at the wide sweep of the movement in which they have embarked. They shudder at the contempt of dignities, at the unsparing assaults upon that which has remained hitherto unquestioned in its supremacy, at the iconoclastic zeal of the reformers. They half suspect that they may have made some mistake in their investigations, when they find that the hearty espousal of their sentiments by men of less timidity is revolutionizing the Church, and, for aught they can see to the contrary, may involve the overthrow of the civil government also. Instead, therefore, of following the impulse of their better natures, they gradually work their way out of the current, which flows on and leaves them but little further advanced than when they first began to move. In spite of conscientious convictions of duty, they relapse into an external or partial conformity with the system which they have often publicly

denounced as erroneous. And they endeavor to satisfy themselves and others with the theory that since the true God can be worshiped acceptably only by those who worship him in spirit, therefore it is only the worship of the heart which is of any great moment; the exterior is unimportant, for the heart may refuse its consent to much to which the body submits through deference to the opinion of the world. It is therefore fool-hardiness needlessly to expose one's life to persecutions, from which a little dissembling will shield. The *offense* of the Gospel is thus done away. So convenient a doctrine has always been, and ever will be, popular in seasons of persecution.

The great Reformation of the sixteenth century presents us with signal examples of individuals or entire classes of persons espousing these delusive principles, in greater or less numbers, according to the various countries through which that remarkable awakening spread. They were more numerous where the cruel legislation against heretics warned converts to the "new doctrines" of the fiery trial through which an open profession must compel them to pass. They were fewer where so decided a majority of the population threw off their allegiance to Rome, or the government itself was so favorable to the Reformation, that the prospect of being called to seal the confession of the Gospel with a martyr's death was distant and indistinct. In France, where the theological faculty of the most famous university of Christendom, at the first note of the Reformation, prepared for a sanguinary conflict, and declared that it was absurd to suppose that God had reserved the discovery of what is necessary to the salvation of the faithful to be made by Luther alone; as though Christ had left his spouse, the Church, until now in darkness and the blindness of error; and that such teachings were a denial of the first principles of the faith, an open profession of impiety, an arrogance so extravagant as to need to be repressed by chains, censures, nay, by fire and flames, rather than refuted by argument;* where the courts of justice, with the Parliament at their head, resorted at once to the most severe measures to stifle the nascent reform, and burned men, women, and chil-

² Determinatio Theologorum Parisiensium super doctrina Lutheriana, in Bretschneider, Corpus Reformatorum. T. i, pp. 366, seq.

dren at slow fires, cunningly devising contrivances for lengthening the lives of the sufferers, that they might protract their agonies; in France, as might have been expected, the number of those who endeavored to avoid prison and the stake by an external compliance with the ordinances of the Roman Catholic religion was very great, and it comprised persons of every grade in social life, from those who were near to the throne to the poorest subjects of the king. The reformers themselves, those brave men who, in defense of the faith which had been implanted in their bosoms by the Holy Ghost, were not slow in exposing themselves to any danger which might await them in the discharge of their duty, denominated these timid and compromising brethren, who had not the courage openly to defend the hope that was in them, *Nicodemites*, after the member of the Sanhedrim who, though he was convinced of the divine mission of Jesus, would come to him for instruction only by night for fear of the Jews. Witnesses as they were of the incalculable mischief which had been inflicted upon the cause that was dearest to their hearts by the weakness of these fearful souls, it must not surprise us to find them denouncing their sin in no measured terms. They warned them of the impending anger of God, of his rejection of all worship which is offered by impure lips, of the ruin in which all shall be involved who continue to defile the service of the Almighty by intermingling with it heathen rites. Farel and Calvin were, as we shall see, peculiarly strenuous in urging upon their converts an entire renunciation of the errors of Romanism. The fatal results of an opposite course were indeed so potent in the examples of a number of prominent personages who had at first declared in favor of a reformation, that there was scarcely an excuse for those who should persist in following in their steps.

Prominent among those who embraced the cause of the Reformation of the Church during the early part of the history of that movement was the Count of Montbrun, William Bricconnet. This singular man, with whose name is linked, in the memory of the student of history, so much of mingled pleasure and sadness, was of high rank and extensive influence. His father, better known as the Cardinal of St. Malo, after serving Louis XI. in the civil administration, had been rewarded

by receiving the abbacy of St. Germain-des-Prés and the archbishopric of Reims; and in virtue of the latter office, he had anointed Louis XII. at his accession. The pope gratified the French monarch by giving the archbishop a cardinal's hat; but Briçonnet the elder, more mindful of his obligations to his king than of his allegiance to the holy see, not only headed the French party in the consistory, but ventured to brave the resentment of the Roman court by joining the council of Pisa, which Louis XII. had caused to be convoked in order to resist the papal encroachments. The younger Briçonnet, born before his father's ordination, was destined to meet with equal favor. Rich benefices were heaped upon him. He was made archdeacon of Reims and of Avignon, then abbot of the same rich foundation of St. Germain which his father had obtained, and finally he entered the episcopate as Bishop of Lodève, whence he was transferred to the see of Meaux, an important town in Brie, nearly thirty miles eastward of Paris, of which Bossuet was, at a later day, bishop. Briçonnet was a man of considerable learning, of singular fondness for the subtleties of a refined mysticism, and of a kind and gentle temper. While at Rome, whither he went as royal ambassador just before entering upon his duties as Bishop of Meaux, he had become more and more convinced of the thorough reform which was needed throughout the whole Church. His first acts in his diocese were those of a reformer. He called upon the ecclesiastics who, neglecting their charges, had been in the habit of spending their time in pleasure at the capital, to return to their pastoral duties. He took steps to initiate a reformation of manners and morals among the clergy. He forbade the Franciscan monks to enter the pulpits of the churches under his supervision. He invited from Paris that remarkable man, Jacques Lefèvre, of Etaples, in Picardy.

Lefèvre was in himself a host. He well deserved the name of the forerunner of the Reformation; for in 1512, five years before Luther posted his theses on the doors of the cathedral at Wittenberg, he published his Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul, which clearly proclaimed the insufficiency of works, and the necessity of faith, as the ground of justification for the sinner. Born in comparative insignificance, he

had raised himself, by his talents and industry, to the very first rank among the instructors of the great Parisian University, whose halls were frequented, as the Venetian ambassador, Marino Giustiniano informed the doge and senate, a few years later, by twenty-five thousand scholars coming from every part of Christendom.* Equally distinguished as a mathematician, as an astronomer, as a critic and biblical student, he had, even while superstitiously rigid in his observance of the prescribed fasts of the Roman Church, and glad to deck the shrines of the saints with flowers, seen, with a prophet's eye, the coming reformation; and his pupil, Farel, reports his significant utterance: "William, the world will be renewed, and you will see it!" But Lefèvre had begun to emerge from his blind devotion to the rites of a corrupt Church, and had turned his vigorous mind to the investigation of matter more closely connected with the Scriptures. He had applied a sound criticism to the traditional accounts of the chief persons spoken of in the New Testament, and had published a treatise to prove that Mary, the sister of Lazarus, Mary Magdalene, and the "woman which was a sinner," were three distinct persons. The Greek Church had always recognized this to be the truth, but the Latin fathers, less skilled in hermeneutics, confounded together the "three Marys," as they were called. The Sorbonne pronounced the doctrine of Lefèvre to be heretical, the Bishop of Paris induced his episcopal brother, Fisher, of Rochester, to write a refutation, and Lefèvre might have fared ill at the hands of the Parliament, which was beginning to proceed against him as a heretic, had not the king, Francis I., been led by his confessor, himself a *moderate* in religion, to forbid any further annoyance of the learned doctor.

Such was the most important man of learning whom Briçonnet invited to his diocese. Then there was the impetuous William Farel, a pupil of Lefèvre, a man whose very name has become a synonym for bold and unflinching courage. Gérard Roussel, another pupil, but of a far more retiring and timid character, was also among those who obeyed the summons to Meaux. Under their supervision the work of reformation rapidly advanced. The pulpits of the diocese, until now

* Relazione di Francia del clarissimo Marino Giustiniano, (A. D. 1535,) in the Relazioni Venete. T. i, p. 149.

rarely entered except for the purpose of calling upon the people to contribute to the wants of the monks, were filled by evangelical clergymen, to whom the people listened with eagerness and amazement; for the Gospel had never been heard from the mouths of their spiritual advisers. Lefèvre the scholar, not only preached, but busied himself in the work of translating the sacred Scriptures into the vernacular, that the people might possess and understand it for themselves. First he published the four Gospels, (1523,) and a few months later the remainder of the New Testament. The effect of the dissemination of this version of the word of God, which formed the basis for the subsequent translation of Robert Olivetan, so important in the history of the progress of Protestantism in France, was at once visible. The copies were eagerly sought; the poor received the Gospel gratuitously when they could not pay even the small sum demanded, from the liberality of the good bishop. Briçonnet introduced the French Scriptures into the churches of Meaux, where the people listened to the lessons in an intelligible language and were delighted. An autograph letter, recently discovered among the rich treasures of the public library of Geneva, from Lefèvre to his absent pupil, Farel, pictures to us the immediate results of the publication, and the glowing hopes of the reformer. He writes:

'Good God, with what joy do I exult when I perceive that the grace of the pure knowledge of Christ has already spread over a good part of Europe; and I hope that Christ is at length about to visit our France with this benediction. You can scarcely imagine with what ardor God is moving the minds of the simple in some places to embrace his Word since the books of the New Testament have been published in French; but you will justly lament that they have not been more widely scattered among the people. Some enemies have endeavored, under cover of the authority of the Parliament, to hinder the work; but our most generous king has become in this matter the defender of the cause of Christ, declaring it to be his will that his kingdom shall hear the word of God without impediment in that tongue which it understands. Now throughout our entire diocese, on feast-days and especially on Sunday, both the Epistle and the Gospel are read to the people in their native tongue, and the parish priest adds a word of exhortation to the Epistle or Gospel, or both at his own discretion.*

* Letter of Lefèvre, dated Meaux, July 6, 1524, in the *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français*. T. xi, (1862,) pp. 212, 213.

While Briçonnet was forwarding the cause of the Reformation by helping Lefèvre to publish and disseminate the Scriptures, he strove to accomplish much by personal efforts. It was while preaching to the people on one occasion that he is said to have uttered a prophetic warning to his hearers: "Even should I, your bishop, change my voice and teaching, beware that you change not with me."

But the bright prospect opening before the eyes of French reformers was destined soon to be turned into cloud and darkness. The monks whom Briçonnet had offended proved themselves terrible antagonists. They called upon the Parisian University and Parliament to interpose; and the bishop, who at first had given tokens of courage, and had ventured to denounce the doctors of theology as Pharisees and false prophets, at length wavered and trembled before the storm he had raised. Three years (1523-1525) witnessed the gradual but sure progress of his apostasy from the profession of his convictions. Beginning with the mere withdrawal of his permission accorded to "the evangelical doctors," as they were called, to preach within his diocese, he ended by presiding over a synod of his own clergy, in which the reading of the works of Luther was prohibited upon pain of excommunication, and by giving a public sanction to the abuses against which he had so loudly protested. The rapid advance of his conformity with the requisitions of the Papal Church was doubtless owing not a little to fresh complaints against his orthodoxy, and a summons to appear before an inquisitorial commission appointed by the Parliament, which, however, he succeeded in satisfying in respect to his future, if not as to his past course.

Meanwhile, although himself the instrument of persecution in the hands of the fanatical portion of the French clergy,* it is probable that Briçonnet still retained his early sentiments. Such, at least, was the belief of the reformers, who pointed to

* The cotemporary chronicle recently published by the French Historical Society, under the title of "*Journal d'un Bourgeois de Paris, sous le règne de François-Ier.*" (p. 284,) under date of April 14, 1526, records the sentence of a poor wool-carder of Meaux, who, for having denied the efficacy of holy water, the utility of prayers for the dead, the propriety of worshipping images, etc., was condemned to seven years' imprisonment in the prisons of the Bishop of Meaux, and to be fed on bread and water.

him as to a signal instance of the fatal results of tampering with the truth, and attempting to reconcile an inward conviction of the truth with an external conformity with erroneous practices. Nor need we wonder at the solemn earnestness with which they employed this example of worse than Nicodemite timidity, to deter the feeble among the early confessors of a purer Christianity from so pernicious and soul-destroying a delusion as that which had involved Briçonnet in ruin. It is true that the "evangelical doctors" of Meaux, who, at the prelate's invitation, had come to preach the Gospel in his episcopal residence, although dispersed, were not all silent. The weakness that denied Farel a shelter in the vicinity of Paris was the occasion of his going back to preach in his native Dauphiny, and then carrying the word of life to Montbelliard, and to Neufchâtel, Geneva, and so many other towns in French Switzerland. Nor did the common people of Meaux and its vicinity, who had been brought to a knowledge of the truth by the instrumentality of the bishop, share in the cowardly denial of that truth. Obedient rather to his own exhortation addressed to them when nothing seemed less likely to be realized than a prognostication of his fall, while "he changed his voice and teaching," they had obtained too strong a faith in the truths proclaimed to them not to "refuse to change with him." And yet the cause of Protestantism in France was deprived of a spectacle which it needed in that period of its infancy, of a man of high rank in Church and State, and possessing the intimacy and confidence of the king and of his sister Margaret, at a later date Queen of Navarre, forsaking all these advantages and exposing himself, not to mere persecution, but to a martyr's death in attestation of his faith. What might not have been the beneficial results for France, it has been well remarked, of the death at the stake of a Bishop of Lodève and Meaux, Count of Montbrun, and successful negotiator for the king of France? But while thousands of poor wool-carders and other despised artisans sealed their confession with their blood, this titled prelate preferred to veil his true sentiments under a hypocritical conformity, and the cause of Protestantism throughout the world has felt the disastrous results of his sad want of resolution up to the present day.

While Bishop Briçonnet furnishes us an instance of a Nicode-

mite timidity, amounting in effect to absolute apostasy, the history of two of his assistants at Meaux presents to us a less distinct, and therefore perhaps more dangerous type of the same delusion. The aged Lefèvre, the forerunner of the Reformation, like him who came to herald the coming of our Saviour, was by no means "a reed shaken by the wind," and yet he lacked the inflexible courage of the Baptist. His contemplative soul was wearied with the continuous conflicts in which the determined athlete must engage. Rescued from his persecutors, as a learned man, by the interposition of Francis I., he obtained the quiet post of librarian of the royal collection of books at the castle of Blois, on the Loire. Even here we find him "somewhat annoyed" by his enemies, as Queen Margaret of Navarre informs us in one of her letters, which Prof. Génin has printed from the original in the Imperial Library;* and she readily obtained permission to take the venerable doctor with her to Nérac, where, cherished and loved by the king of Navarre and herself, he passed away the few remaining years of his pilgrimage. His mind was, however, not at rest even in these unmolested retreats. An affecting incident is told of his last hours. While sitting at the royal table, a few days before his death, Lefèvre was observed to weep, whereupon Queen Margaret complained of the sadness of one whose society she had sought for her own diversion, and asked the occasion of his sorrow. "How can I minister to the joy of others, who am myself the greatest sinner upon earth?" was Lefèvre's mournful and unexpected response. Pressed to explain himself, the old man, after admitting that through a long life he had maintained exemplary morality of conduct, exclaimed in words frequently interrupted by sobs: "How shall I be able to stand at God's tribunal, who have taught others the purity of the Gospel? Thousands have suffered and died in defense of the doctrine in which I instructed them; and I, unfaithful shepherd that I am, after reaching so advanced an age, when I ought to love nothing less than life, or rather to desire death, have basely avoided the martyr's crown, and betrayed the cause of my God!" The queen and the other persons who were present administered such consolation to the pious Lefèvre as they could find, and

* *Lettres de Marguerite d'Angoulême.* T. i, pp. 279, 280.

shortly afterward he died, relying on the forgiveness of his Maker, leaving his library to his disciple, Gérard Roussel, and the rest of his scanty property to the poor. The truth of this story, which rests upon the authority of Hubert Thomas, counselor of state and secretary of the elector palatine, has been discredited by Bayle in his *Critical Dictionary*, and after him by Tabaraud in the *Biographie Universelle*, and more lately by Haag, in his great work on French Protestant Biography. All rest their rejection of the story chiefly upon the entire silence of the reformers, who might well be expected to notice so suggestive an occurrence, were it indeed authentic. But in this instance, as in so many others, it has been proved how unreliable are all such arguments. With singular good fortune, M. Jules Bonnet has, within a few months, discovered among the unexplored treasures of the Genevese public library a minute, in the handwriting of the reformer Farel, which demonstrates the truth of the circumstances described by Hubert Thomas. He writes:

Our master, Jacques Lefèvre, of Etaples, when suffering from the disease by which he died, was for some days so greatly terrified by the judgment of God that he cried out that his fate was sealed, saying that he was eternally lost, because he had not openly professed the truth of God. This complaint he continued to utter day and night. When Gérard Roussel admonished him to be of good courage and trust in Christ, he answered, "I am condemned; I have concealed the truth which I ought to have professed and openly borne witness to." It was a fearful sight to see so pious an old man so distressed in mind and overwhelmed by so great a dread of the judgment of God. At length, however, freed from his fears, he began to entertain a good hope in Christ.*

The faithful and intrepid reformer of Neufchâtel was no sooner informed of the gloom that had attended the last hours of his former master than he wrote, as he tells us, to one of those who with him had once sat at the feet of the sage of

* "Jacobus Faber Stapulensis noster, laborans morbo quo decessit, per aliquot dies ita perterritus fuit iudicio Dei, ut actum de se vociferaret, dicens se æternum perissee, quod veritatem Dei non aperte professus fuerit, idque dies noctesque vociferando querebatur; et cum a Gerardo Rufo admoneretur ut bono esset animo, Christo quoque fideret, is respondit: Nos damnati sumus, veritatem celavimus quam profiteri et testari palam debebamus. Horrendum erat tam pium senem ita angere animo et tanto horrore iudicii Dei concuti; licet tandem liberatus bene sperare cœperit ac perrexerit de Christo."—Published for the first time in the *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français*. T. xi, (1862.) pp. 214, 215.

Étapes. This was Michael d'Arande, who, although a Protestant at heart, had remained in the Roman Church, and was now Bishop of Saint-Paul-Trois-Châteaux, in Dauphiny. What Farel would write under such circumstances we may easily infer from our knowledge of the character and history of that faithful servant of God, although he thought it important only to preserve the reply of the bishop to his admonitory letter. The Bishop of Saint-Paul-Trois-Châteaux begins with a picture of the terror which the reading of Farel's announcement of Lefèvre's death had wrought on his entire inner man. He acknowledges that he hears the voice of Jesus Christ himself exhorting him to courage, so justly that he can answer nothing, but must own himself altogether guilty. And the poor man, a bishop of an important diocese, closes by solemnly adjuring the exile and reformer, by the same Lord Jesus, to help him by continual prayer on his behalf, and meanwhile not to desist from ever soliciting him by exhortations, in order that at length he may be able to extricate himself from the deep mire, in which he finds no firm foundation on which his foot may rest. And then, as if remembering that there was danger in committing to paper the record of his internal disquietude, the prelate concludes with the remark that the bearer will give him other details, and will salute him in the name of that Being without whose assistance, all effort is of no avail.* Such a letter depicts, more plainly than could any mere description, the fearful abyss of doubt, remorse, and conscious weakness into which many a well-disposed, but irresolute man plunged, and remained in a life-long misery, continually hoping and praying that the Almighty, by some extraordinary interposition, could impart the necessary strength and courage to enable the poor victim to rescue himself. It was more in

* We extract the greater part of this remarkable epistle: "Vix puto transitum pili illius senis Stapulensis tam vehementer animum tuum percussisse quam me totum perterruerunt littere tuæ et piæ et Christianæ, dum eas lecitarem, non solum stilo quodam humano, sed gladio etiam Spiritus spiritum atque animam proscindentes ac pertrahentes, præsertim cum depingunt mihi ac preponunt Christum Jesum ita me confortantem ac mecum tam juste expostulantem, ut nihil omnino mihi relinquatur aliud quod opponam nisi quod me modis omnibus rerum ac convictum illi dedam. Quare ne te diutius impediam, rogo te atque obtestor per eundem Dominum nostrum Jesum ut me continuis vestris precibus adjuvetis, atque interim vestris exhortationibus semper sollicitare non desistatis, *quo tandem ex hoc profundo limo in quo non est substantia erigi queam.*"

sadness and pity than in anger that those undaunted men who had sacrificed native land, possessions, the prospect of preferment in Church and State, even the security of life itself, and had acquired nerve by the sacrifice, looked upon such instances of pusillanimity.

It must not be supposed, however, that the Nicodemites, in refusing to come forth boldly as the advocates of the new doctrines, and thus to become exposed to the fury of persecution, resigned themselves with a blind devotion to all the abuses which were rife in the papal Church. On the contrary, many of those who assumed this character were distinguished for the incipient reforms which they nurtured in their neighborhood, and not infrequently they were thus the instruments of accomplishing much good. But by the inconsistent course which they adopted, while they alienated the affections of the decided Protestants, they no less surely forfeited the confidence of the opposite party, who refused to view them as other than disguised enemies. Such was the case with Gérard Roussel, Rufi, or Rufus, to whom we have already referred as one of the most prominent among Lefèvre's disciples. Gérard Roussel, a fine scholar and preacher, after having entered into orders, had been invited to Meaux, where the bishop had made him canon and treasurer of the cathedral. When the more decided reformers had found themselves obliged to leave Meaux, in order to enjoy the privilege of expressing their views openly, Roussel remained; for we find in a document recently discovered in the archives of the Roman Catholic Seminary of that city,* that as late as the early months of 1525 he was accused before the chapter of possessing papers containing matters defamatory of the pope, from which a placard had been concocted and posted upon the walls of the church. At the same time he was called to account for neglecting to repeat the Ave Maria in the service, to the great scandal of the people. In his defense, Roussel maintained that the Lord's Prayer was quite as efficacious as the "angelic salutation" on which so much stress was laid, and that the bishop alone was competent to reprove him if he had offended. When, however, Briçonnet had completed his renunciation of the reforms which he had

* Printed in the Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français. T. x, (1861), pp. 219-221.

himself inaugurated, Gérard Roussel found it necessary to abandon the neighborhood of Paris; and we hear of him, a little subsequently, within the dominions of the king and queen of Navarre, whose chaplain he became. Seven or eight years later, indeed, when the disposition of Francis I. seems temporarily favorable, he is one of the "evangelical preachers," in company with Courault and Berthault, whom Margaret brings to Paris, to preach lenten discourses in the churches of the capital before the king and court. But the attempt to convert the court failed, and Roussel returned to Navarre. The queen made him successively Abbot of Clairac and Bishop of Oléron. The latter of these dignities he retained until his death. In his own diocese he set the example of a faithful shepherd. Contrasting his piety with the worldliness of the majority of the French bishops of that age, even that apostate and bitter enemy of the Reformation, Florimond de Remond, is compelled to admit that his life was apparently one of unusual sanctity. The pack of dogs and hounds was superseded by a host of poor; his horses and brilliant attendants by a troop of children whom he supported while they pursued their studies.* Yet the malice of the monks, whose licentiousness and covetousness he severely reprimanded, was not disarmed by the purity of his morals and life. Gérard Roussel fell a victim to the fanaticism of one De Maytie, who, entering a church in which the eloquent bishop was declaiming against the excessive multiplication of feast days, drew from beneath his mantle an ax, which he had brought with him for the purpose, and overthrew the pulpit. Roussel soon afterward died from the effects of his fall, expressing, it is said, upon his death-bed the same regrets which had disquieted that of his master Lefèvre; nor is the statement unworthy of credit. His murderer, on the other hand, was acquitted by the parliament of Bordeaux, before which he had been arraigned,† on the ground that the act which occasioned the death of so dangerous a

* Porro quia Rufus ille singularis alicujus sanctitatis speciem in moribus et vita externa pre se ferebat, ut qui loco canum et vertagorum, pauperum catenam; et pro equis ac satellitio, multos pueros et literarum studiis destinatos aleret, etc.—Florimond de Remond, *Historia de ortu, progressu, et ruina hæreseon*, l. vii, c. 3, Lat. ed. of Cologne, 1614.

† Haag, *La France Protestante*, s. v. Gérard Roussel; Gaillard, *Histoire de François Ier.* T. vi, p. 418.

heretic as the Bishop of Oléron, if not meritorious, was at most a venial offense.

In the case of Gérard Roussel, as in that of most of the other representatives of this class, there is so little of true candor and so much dissimulation, so little bold reformatory zeal and so much mysticism,* that abundant room has been left for discussion as to the position which ought to be assigned to him in the world-wide conflict of the sixteenth century. M. Tabaraud, in the *Biographie Universelle*, maintained, from a Roman Catholic point of view, his substantial orthodoxy; while the vast majority of Protestant writers claim him as a sincere but timid adherent of the Reformation. This diversity of opinion in itself demonstrates the falseness of his position. Yet we cannot doubt that he was at heart an enemy of the system to which an excess of worldly prudence led him to conform in many particulars. That such was the opinion of the great French and Swiss reformers is evident from the fact, for which Florimond de Remond vouches,† that it was against him especially that Calvin directed his work against the Nicodemites. And the same unfriendly authority calls Roussel the first person clothed in a Catholic habit who, in opposition to the consent of the Church in all ages, publicly gave the eucharist under both forms to communicants. He tells us that Roussel, in order to attract the people, generally employed the vulgar tongue in his prayers; and he confirms his proofs of the heterodoxy of the bishop, by relating that his vicar, a man of the same stamp, as soon as his superior was killed, "threw aside the cowl, married a wife, and became a minister of the Gospel."

We ought here to delineate the course of that worthy patron of the learned and defender of the oppressed, Queen Margaret of Navarre herself; but to give even a sketch of her life would occupy far greater space than we can afford at present. Her eventful career constitutes a subject well worthy of separate treatment; the contrasts and inconsistencies of her character are too marked to be treated satisfactorily within the compass of a few lines. A woman whose purity of life placed her above reproach or suspicion, she was yet the author of tales whose

* Prof. Schmidt, the eminent historian and theologian of Strasburg, has made Roussel, as the type of the mystics, the subject of an able monograph.

† *Historia de ortu, progressu, et ruina hereseon*, l. c.

tone can only be excused in consideration of the license of the age and court in which she lived. One of the earliest friends of the Reformation, which she furthered by the composition of her "Mirror of a Sinful Soul" not less than by her intercession on behalf of its professors, she never completely renounced her connection with the Roman Church; and, if we could credit the statements of that gossippy writer Brantôme, practiced superstitious rites even in her old age. Meanwhile, we know that she gave an asylum and entertainment in her court to some of the most dangerous of the sect of the Libertines, whose pestilent doctrines had infected so many liberal minds in France and the Low Countries. Indignant at an attack upon them which seemed to reflect upon herself, she signified to the Genevese reformer her dissatisfaction with his course, whereupon he answered in the courtly and yet faithful letter of April 28, 1545,* a single sentence of which sufficiently justifies his motives: "A dog barks when he sees his master assailed; I should be a very coward, if, seeing the truth of God thus attacked, I were mute and spoke not a word."

We have already referred to the Latin treatise against the Nicodemites, in the shape of two letters, the second of which is addressed to Gérard Roussel, published by Calvin for the first time in 1537.† But the temptations to dissimulation were so strong, and there were so many that fell victims to the snares which were laid in France for those who were timid, that the same writer deemed it advisable, fifteen years later, to collect and publish in the French language four popular discourses which he had delivered at Geneva, under the title of "Four Sermons treating of Matters very useful for our Times." A perusal of this treatise, while it will convince any reader of its appropriateness to meet the end which the author has in view, will also reveal the difficulties encountered by the timid disciple in France, and the subterfuges which suggested themselves as furnishing a ready means for their avoidance. In the first sermon, from the text, "Their drink offerings of blood will I not offer, nor take up their names into my lips," (Psa. xvi, 4.)

* Lettres Françaises de Calvin, recueillies par Jules Bonnet. T. i, p. 111 seq.

† Epistolæ duæ: prima de fugiendis impiorum illicitis sacris et puritate Christianæ religionis; secunda de Christiani hominis officio in sacerdotiis papalis ecclesiæ vel administrandis vel abjiciendis.

the reformer enjoined the partakers of the same blessed faith with himself to flee from all external idolatry. He exhibited in clearest terms the guilt of those who consented to the mass under the pretext that it is but a disguise of the Lord's supper, by comparing it to the calves which Jeroboam set up at Dan and Bethel, in the name of the Lord who had brought Israel up out from Egypt. He answered those who excused themselves on the ground that the magistrates alone had the power to reform what was corrupt, by insisting that the private individual is responsible for the purity of his own body and soul, not for that of the streets and temples. He reproves with deserved severity the hypocrisy of those who, "after attending the mass throughout the year, at Easter seek out some secluded chapel, where a semi-christian monk celebrates for them a bastard supper of the Lord, from which all intention of the adoration of the Host is banished, and where both the bread and the wine are dispensed to all the participants." Some, he tells us, do not avoid the rite of baptism as performed in the churches, because they assert that there is no manifest idolatry connected with it; others go to the churches, but watch their opportunity that they may not be present at the mass, just as if the incense offered to idols, the prayers for the intercession of some saint, and the hymn "*Salve Regina*," were not quite as blasphemous. The author here pertinently recalls the fact that the very ground on which most of the early Christian martyrs suffered death, was their refusal to offer perfume or incense to idols. And yet to those who still remain in perplexity in respect to their duty, no clearer rule for their guidance can be given than the ample directions of the Word of God. Those who ask more are compared to men who, on being exhorted to modesty of dress and accouterment, would have the preacher cut out their stockings and sew their shoes. In the second sermon, exhorting to the endurance of persecution for Christ's sake and the Gospel's, Calvin enforces his teachings by a memorable example of fortitude. "A young man who lived here with us, having been arrested in the city of Tournay, was condemned to be beheaded if he recanted, and to be burned alive if he persisted in his sentiments. When asked what he wished to do, he simply answered, 'He who will give me grace to die patiently for his name, will doubtless give me grace to endure

the fire.'” The third and fourth sermons exhibit the duty of prizing the privilege of being in the Church of God, and of exposing one’s self to toil and privation in order to obtain liberty to worship God purely. To those who refuse to leave a land in which they have no opportunity to worship God as their consciences dictate, under pretext of the duty they owe to their natural prince, there is an easy answer. There is not one of them who would hesitate to abandon his native place if he were in lack of food, or if he could multiply in a foreign land the property he now possesses. The author meets with boldness the objections which avarice and ambition and love of ease raise against forsaking schemes of emolument and preferment, or of undisturbed quiet, and then adds: “It is strange that many think they can shut our mouths if we do not assign them a position and means of living while serving God. ‘My condition,’ say they, ‘is such and such in my country; if I leave it, what will become of me, or how shall I be fed?’ As if God had ordained those who preach the Gospel stewards, to give accommodation to all in his states, and to furnish to each, according to his quality, board and wages. . . . The evil is, that they wish to keep their entire possessions, and cannot suffer to be curtailed in honors or riches, nor to be deprived of their ease and delights; that is to say, they cannot bow their neck and bend to bear Jesus Christ.”

Such were the attempts of the great Genevese reformer to remove one of the most serious obstacles in the way of the progress of Protestantism in France; that is to say, the reluctance of those who were more or less fully convinced intellectually of the truths of the Gospel, to confess their belief openly and suffer in attestation of it. His zeal was naturally displeasing to those who felt but little inclination to expose themselves to loss of property, honor, and life. Strong objections were raised against the decided position which he had assumed, and the reformer was compelled not only to justify himself in an “Apology,” written in 1545—that is, seven years before the publication of the sermons just referred to—but to obtain the opinion of the other reformers of Switzerland and Germany, to whom his opponents had also appealed. His letters to Luther and Melancthon, and the response of Melancthon, have been preserved. All breathe a spirit of cordial sympathy

and esteem, in spite of differences on minor points. Bucer, Peter Martyr, and Melancthon, all coincided in the views respecting the necessity of that open profession of the Gospel on which Calvin insisted. Melancthon, it is true, made greater concessions than the Genevese reformer approved; but all agreed, as we are informed by Theodore de Bèze, that one cannot serve two masters.* This general unanimity encouraged Calvin to publish the sermons to which we have glanced, as well as to make great private exertion to reclaim individuals of distinction, such as François Daniel and Louis du Chemin, who still refused to forsake their external connection with the Church of Rome. Nor were these labors fruitless, for Theodore de Bèze assures us that "these writings were the cause of great blessing, since many now came to a determination to devote themselves wholly to God, who had hitherto been asleep in their uncleanness."

ART. VI.—OUR ANTIPODES.

The History of New South Wales. With an Account of Van Diemen's Land, [Tasmania,] New Zealand, Port Philip, [Victoria,] Moreton Bay, and other Australian Settlements. Comprising a complete view of the Progress and Prospects of Gold Mining in Australia. The whole Compiled from Official and other Authentic and Original Sources. By RODERICK FLANIGAN, member of the Australian Literary Institute, and of the Philosophical Society of New South Wales. 2 vols. 8vo. London: Sampson Low, Son, & Co. 1862.

The Three Colonies of Australia: New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia; their Pastures, Copper Mines, and Gold Fields. By SAMUEL SIDNEY, author of "The Australian Hand-Book," etc. 1 vol. 12mo. New York: C. M. Saxton, Barker & Co. 1860.

Land, Labor, and Gold; or, Two Years in Victoria. With Visits to Sydney and Van Diemen's Land. By WILLIAM HOWITT. 2 vols. 12mo. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1855.

British Enterprise Beyond the Seas: or, The Planting of Our Colonies. By J. H. FYFE, author of "The Triumph of Invention and Discovery." 1 vol. 12mo. London: T. Nelson & Sons. 1863.

* Bèze, *Histoire Ecclesiastique des Eglises Réformées de France*, (ed. of Lille.) T. i, p. 31. See also Henry, *Life of Calvin*, ii, pp. 7-14 and App.; and Calvin's *Letters*, (Eng. ed. of Jules Bonnet,) i, pp. 434 seq., 440-447.

Australia; with Notes by the Way, on Egypt, Ceylon, Bombay, and the Holy Land. By FREDERICK JOBSON, D.D. Second edition revised. 1 vol. 8vo. London: Hamilton, Adams, & Co. 1862.

Expeditions into the Interior of Eastern Australia; with Descriptions of Australia Felix and New South Wales. By T. L. MITCHELL. 2 vols. 8vo. London: 1838.

Tracks of M'Kinlay and Party across Australia. By JOHN DAVIS, one of the Expedition. Edited from Mr. Davis's Manuscript Journal; with an Introductory View of the recent Australian Expedition of M'Douall Stuart, Burke, Wills, Landsborough, etc. By WILLIAM WESTGARTH, author of "Victoria and the Australian Gold Mines," etc. With Maps and Illustrations. 1 vol. 8vo. London: Sampson Low, Son, & Co. 1863.

British Sessional Papers. Parliamentary Reports of The Australian Exploring Expedition of Burke and Wills. 1862.

Journal of the Royal Geographical Society. Volume XXXII. London: 1862.

Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society. Volumes VI and VII. Sessions of 1861, 1863.

IF we should start from San Diego, near the south-western corner of the United States, and go straight through the center of the earth, provided we safely passed whatever interior floods, granitic obstructions, and central fires intervene, we should "revisit the glimpses of the moon" near the south-westernmost point of the great island-continent of Australia. A journey otherwise than imaginary by this underland route we do not think would be altogether safe or comfortable; but it is a very short passage, and enables one to "define his position" relative to the regions to be visited. The dimensions and shape of the continent isle are not unlike those of our own nationality. Its outline is more regular, and it stretches away from the point designated toward the torrid regions, while the United States extends in the opposite direction. The length of each from east to west is about twenty-five hundred miles, and the breadth from north to south about fifteen hundred. They contain also each nearly three million square miles; the mineral treasures are similar, and the race who occupy and are to occupy both are substantially one. Here all correspondence ceases, and the two territories become as dissimilar in character as they are antipodal in situation. It is summer there when it is winter here, and our day is their night. There "the barometer rises before bad weather and falls before good;" the north is the hot wind and the south the cold; the poorest cottages are ceiled

with cedar, fields are fenced with mahogany, and myrtle-trees are used for firewood; the swans are black and the eagles are white. "The mole lays eggs and has a duck's bill," and "the cherry grows with a stone on the outside."

It is not unlikely that the existence of Australia has been known to the Chinese and other Asiatic nations for many ages. But none of the western nations appear to have had any intelligence of it till after the beginning of the seventeenth century. In 1601 Manuel di Eredia, a Portuguese, made the first authentic report of a discovery of the shores of this continent. Dutch and Spanish navigators subsequently sighted various points on the coast, though often without even suspecting them to have any territorial connection with each other. Up to 1626 a large proportion of the whole ocean border had been discovered, and the name assigned to the territory inclosed was that of the Great South Land. Afterward the Dutch sailors gave it the appellation of New Holland, by which name it was known till within the present century. In 1642 the whole of Australia was circumnavigated by Tasman, who in the course of his voyage discovered New Zealand and what has till recently been known as Van Diemen's Land, but now properly taken the name of Tasmania. The latter, however, was not thought to be separate from Australia till more than a century and a half afterward.

But the expeditions of the Dutch furnished little knowledge of Australia, and to all practical intents it remained unexplored till the English turned their attention to it. A most unfavorable reputation had got abroad in the world respecting this land. Dampier found the coast forbidding, the land barren and thinly inhabited by the "most unpleasant looking and worst featured of any people" he had ever seen. Tasman's Land was declared to be the abode of "howling evil spirits." It is no wonder that, while there was plenty of other islands, where all mineral and vegetable riches abounded, where the natives revelled in tropical luxuriance, and wealth apparently might be had for the gathering, this whole region should have been neglected.

In 1770 Captain Cook in the course of his explorations came to Botany Bay and examined the coast of New South Wales, stretching along for a thousand miles, and took posses-

sion of the territory in the name of his sovereign. But the great navigator's usual good judgment seems to have been wanting when he selected as a place for a future settlement one of the most miserable swamps on the coast, neglecting to examine inlets, to which even the sailors called his attention, leading to some of the finest harbors in the world and the most eligible town sites.

It is not so strange that neither Captain Cook nor his companions were favorably impressed with the appearance of the country, or that the English government should have regarded it as a suitable residence for the vast army of moral incurables, not vicious enough to deserve death, and yet far too bad to live in civilized society. The jails were frightfully overcrowded. The American colonies had become independent, and there was no more opportunity to send to the plantations of Virginia and the Carolinas those interesting subjects who were afterward to develop into the "superior race," against whose rule the northern Roundheads would revolt in vain. It was necessary that some new convict station should be found. In its perplexity the government recollected the thousand miles of sea-coast discovered by Captain Cook on the other side of the world, and it was determined to lay the foundations of a penal colony there.

If the design had been to extemporize a Tartarus, the plan of transportation was better than even the locality chosen; for never were human elements more completely adapted and proportioned for the formation of a social pandemonium than those selected by the first commissioner of transportation. The idea of reformatory discipline was not very seriously thought of, though doubtless there were strong hopes cherished by some influential persons that reformation to a portion of the convicts might be the result. The criminals were gathered miscellaneously without any pretense of selection. There were six hundred men and two hundred and fifty women, the latter being not only the most abandoned of their sex, but many of them aged and infirm, and even idiotic. This great disproportion was not only maintained, but increased, till the females were scarcely a seventh of the population. The results were, of course, deplorable. A military guard of two hundred men and officers accompanied the convicts, but no jailer,

overseer, or superintendent. No schoolmaster was sent; and even a chaplain was not thought of till the last moment. There was no agriculturist to teach his art to men who would so much need it, and whose vocation had been far other than that of farming. Not half a dozen men knew how to use carpenter's tools. There was only one bricklayer, and not a mechanic capable of constructing a corn-mill.

It was in January, 1788, that Captain Phillip arrived in Botany Bay with the first installment of embodied and associated vice. The place was at once found unsuitable for a settlement. Cruising about in search of a better situation, he found, a few miles further north, a narrow opening in the precipitous iron-bound coast. Within was a vast land-locked bay, which at a glance was seen to be a most magnificent harbor. The shores were covered with beautiful groves, while about six miles from the entrance a fine stream of water flowed down into a pleasant cove. Near the mouth of this stream were laid the foundations of what is now the large and populous city of Sydney.

For *such* a colony, however, the spot was far from suitable. A large proportion of the surrounding country was of the most barren character. The only really fertile portions were covered with the heaviest and hardest timber, which the newcomers were incompetent to remove. It was impossible that they could support themselves. Distress and privation beset them almost from their first landing. The rations which they brought with them were soon consumed. Before they had been a year at Sydney there was not four months' provision in the colony, even at half allowance.

Without waiting to hear the success of the experiment, the government dispatched ship after ship laden with prisoners of all degrees of crime. Young lads guilty of petty offenses mingled with male and female convicts of the most abandoned wickedness. The government was of the most despotic character, and grievously mismanaged at that. Of course disorder was very rife, and the convicts held life so cheap that murder would be committed at any time for two or three days' rations. Such was the beginning of what has now become a great, prosperous, and powerful community. The evils were slowly remedied. A system of labor was devised for the convicts,

under which public works were constructed, and the resources of the colony began to be developed. Inducements were held out to free emigrants, it is true, but few were willing to become part of such a society, and those few were not of the most reputable character; but they usually found their profit in it. Much was done from time to time to alleviate the social evils and to prepare the way for the rise of a Christian community. The first administration really adapted to the wants of the settlement was that of Governor Macquarie from 1809 to 1821. He was a man of a rough, arbitrary character, but devoted himself faithfully to the business of his office, and to the good of the colony. But it was only toward the close of his administration that free colonists began to arrive in any considerable numbers at Sydney.

The only great source of wealth to the Australian colonists, previous to the discovery of gold; was in the raising of stock and the growing of wool. It is doubtful, even now, if the mineral treasures of the country, vast as they are, are a greater element of prosperity than the herds and flocks which multiply and thrive so wonderfully in the broad rich pastures of the several colonies. In the transports which brought the first company of settlers there were also brought, among other animals, two bulls and four cows. Whether disgusted with their human associates, or dissatisfied with the want of enterprise in the government, they started on an exploring expedition, in which they made such satisfactory discoveries that they never returned. A few years afterward, by information received from the natives, it was surmised that cattle existed in the wilds beyond the limits of colonial occupation. Search being made, a fine, fat herd of sixty animals was discovered, and by certain peculiarities it was ascertained that they were the offspring of the wanderers. This incident gave a new turn to affairs in the colony. The good sense and discrimination of the cattle in forsaking the barren regions of the coast for capital grazing grounds in the interior, led some of the more enterprising colonists to follow their example. Henceforth stock-raising became an important and lucrative occupation. Probably there is no country in the world where cattle multiply so rapidly and thrive so well as here. Several years afterward a Mr. M'Arthur observed that a great improvement took place in the

fiber of the hairy Bengal and flat-tailed Cape sheep after a brief residence in the colony. It struck him that there were many points of resemblance in soil and climate between Spain and Australia. He accordingly imported a number of the famous Spanish merinoes, who took kindly to the country, and the experiment was found to be surprisingly successful.

The flocks multiplied with a rapidity, if possible, excelling that of the herds. The wool was of the choicest anywhere to be found, and Australia is now the greatest wool-growing country in the world. Once demonstrated to be profitable, many engaged in the business. It became a stimulus to subsidiary occupations, and the colony presented a thriving appearance. Free settlers began to arrive in greater numbers, though still greatly outnumbered by the convict class. Some of these were men of capital and enterprise, others were mere adventurers, and often something worse. It was the saying of blunt old Governor Macquarie some time before this, that "the colony consisted of those who had been transported and those who ought to have been." There was some truth at the bottom of it doubtless, though it was not to be taken as strictly literal.

The colonization of the continent may be said to have kept pace with the discovery of permanent sources of water. Previous to 1820 vigorous efforts at exploration had been rewarded by the discovery of many fine streams, along whose banks were vast plains of richest herbage. Captain Sturt, the most famous of early explorers, discovered the Murumbidgee and Darling, and following them down to their junction with the Murray, floated along this, the great river of Australia, to the sea. Near its mouth was found a wide fertile region, which was soon peopled with the overflowing flocks and herds of the older colony. It was subsequently made a colony by itself, under the name of South Australia. Years afterward Major Mitchell, pushing his energetic explorations along the banks of the same great river, left it at a certain point and struck toward the south. He soon came into a land which, from its exuberant fertility, he called Australia Felix. The newly discovered and inviting regions were speedily occupied by straggling settlers from Tasmania, who were soon met by a large stream of emigration from New South Wales. Here began, in 1836, the now most populous and thriving colony of Victoria.

During the previous year the population had been rapidly increasing. Transportation still continued, but there was much opposition to it, and it was finally abolished in 1839. There have been attempts by certain parties at different times to revive it under pretext of furnishing needed laborers in the settlements, and for other reasons, but without success. Some of the convicts conducted themselves respectably, and received their freedom as a reward; others served out their time, and then were free. Many of them became wealthy and influential citizens. One of this class died in 1840, worth two and a half millions of dollars. But, of course, the large proportion, whether emancipated or still held in durance, were of a vicious character. Many, too, of the free settlers were no better. The irregularities of the government, the absence of the social restraints operative in older communities, the small proportion of females, together with the character of the parties above referred to, made the moral condition of the community anything but desirable.

But better elements were continually coming in. Men of education and refinement were found among the population. Schools were established, churches erected, the laws were gradually adapted to the wants of the people, and the civilizing influences of religion, education, systemized industry, commerce, and government produced their usual results.

One noble-minded, philanthropic woman did much to advance the interests of the colonies. We have alluded to the paucity of females in the population, and may easily infer from it some of the numerous ills traceable to this cause. Mrs. Chisholm visiting Sydney with her husband, an officer of the Madras army, on furlough, detected this evil and sought to provide a remedy.

She established a Home in Sydney, where young and friendless women were received on their arrival in the colony, and where emigrants, desiring to proceed inland, obtained information and advice. Finding that there was a demand, not merely for domestic servants, but for wives, among the stock-breeders in the bush, and that many girls were frightened to proceed alone, Mrs. Chisholm collected a party, and herself led them to their destination.

The enterprise was successful. By the end of 1842 she had succeeded in placing comfortably two thousand emigrants of both sexes. She went herself among the interior settlements, from house to house, studying the character of the people, and

adapting her work to the wants of the several classes intended to be benefited. "Shepherds would leave their work, and walk thirty or forty miles to the place where she camped in order to choose a wife, bringing with them certificates of character and their saving-bank books." Mrs. Chisholm afterward visited England and established a system of emigration, in which domestic ties were respected, and by which family groups were transplanted to the other side of the globe.

The land system of Australia is different from that of the United States. It has been one of the great drawbacks on the prosperity of the country. At first all the government lands were disposed of by grant. Officers, civil and military, were furnished with extensive tracts. Free laboring settlers and discharged convicts received smaller grants in proportion to their wants and their means. In time, as the pastoral advantages of the country became evident, and fortunes began to be made from the raising of wool and tallow, the lands were regarded as of more importance. Grants were discontinued, and the public lands were put up at a moderate upset price after survey, and in lots to suit purchasers. But the great wool-growing squatters and capitalists did not like the arrangement, as we shall see, and got it changed for the worse. Vast speculative schemes connected themselves with the new system, and wide-spread disasters ensued.

The settlement of South Australia was concomitant with the formation of one of those immense bubbles which the British people are in the habit of getting up occasionally for their own diversion and the amusement of the rest of mankind. We have the same schemes here in miniature, though perhaps we make up in number what we lack in magnificence. A Mr. Wakefield, who had given some attention to the subject of colonization, came out with a plan for the settlement of the new territory, which he thought vastly superior to anything else, and which appeared plausible to the English mind. It was also very successful on paper. The principal features of this scheme were the fixing of a high upset price on the government lands, and the appropriation of the proceeds of the sales to the securing of free emigration. The object was to form a class of large landholders, to whom there should always be plenty of cheap labor. If a few men who had capital could

buy large tracts, those without capital would be precluded by the high price from obtaining small farms, and thus, by the importation of multitudes of the poorer classes, there would always be abundance of labor at prices so low that there was no danger the laborers would ever become independent proprietors. It was a rule working both ways, and a poor rule at that, always resulting, whichever way it worked, in perpetuating poverty where it existed, and in enriching the rich. Of course, in a new country it was impossible to enforce it wholly, except by such arbitrary and despotic measures as no modern government would dare to adopt. The whole scheme, as looked at from a democratic or American point of view, has the appearance of a piece of impudent injustice. But some of our stolid cousins regarded it as a very nice arrangement, and proceeded to put it in practice. A company was formed with a large capital. By the usual arts it was brought into great public prominence. Large tracts of land were secured. A ship-load of adventurers embarked for Australia; they planted themselves in the wilderness, laid out a city on the banks of a swamp; sent home glowing accounts of the prospects of the colony, received great additions to their number, and went to speculating in town-lots and other real estate. Vast fortunes were made and lost; but no productive business was organized. The people imported all their sustenance and lived on their capital; and when the bubble burst and the appalling crash came, the only elements of society that escaped and were able to succor the suffering were the small farmers, which it had been the policy of the colony to proscribe, and in the way of whose existence every obstacle had been thrown.

There have been great changes in the system of government in the several colonies since the foundation of New South Wales. At first it was a military despotism of the most arbitrary kind. Then the powers of the governor were limited. Then came a council appointed by the crown; afterward modified so as to be partly or wholly elected by the colony; and finally a colonial parliament and a constitution, with the extension of suffrage and substantially the power of self-government. There have been political excitements, social disturbances, riot and insurrection by the convicts, troubles with the natives, financial disaster, and such other experiences as might naturally

be expected in a new country, as well as many that could not have been anticipated. There have been absurd schemes of government, abuses in fixing the relations of labor to capital, much artificial tinkering of social laws which nothing but nature or native good sense is competent to regulate; and deplorable consequences from all these antecedents.

But for all this, the several colonies have grown apace, agriculture and the industrial arts have been developed, sources of wealth unusual and prolific have discovered themselves to such as sought them, an increasing acquaintance with the character of the country has wonderfully improved its reputation; and where the refuse of English jails had at first been emptied, with every prospect of deepening its depravity till the whole mass perished of its own corruption, a great, free, self-supporting community is coming into existence.

There are now five separate colonies in Australia, besides those of New Zealand, Tasmania, and other neighboring islands. New South Wales is the oldest of these, and occupies a large territory in the south-eastern quarter of the continent. Victoria is the smallest in size but the largest in population, owing to the mighty influx of immigration seeking the gold mines, which are principally in its territory. Southern Australia lies next west of Victoria, but extends much further into the interior, and abounds in mineral, agricultural, and pastoral wealth. Western Australia has the largest territory, embracing nearly a million square miles, and is the most sparsely populated and least successful hitherto of all the colonies. Queensland is the youngest of the family, so far as heard from; for in Australia, as in our own country, the march of improvement is so rapid, and the development so swift, that new governments are established without much premonition. The last was separated from New South Wales only four or five years ago. It occupies a large space in the north-eastern part of the continent, extending from Moreton Bay to the Gulf of Carpentaria, and appears to be clearly the most promising portion of the country. There is a likelihood that it may itself soon be divided, and a new colony organized out of its northern district, embracing the peninsula of Cape York. Settlements, too, we believe, have already been made on the north-western coast, where a large rich region will probably be taken from Western Australia and set up for itself.

The colonies together had, in 1860, a population of 1,061,406. It is, of course, much increased by this time. They raise a revenue of more than £6,000,000 annually, and enjoy sufficient credit to have a nucleus of debt to the amount of £10,000,000. Their imports are valued at £26,000,000 a year, and their exports, chiefly gold and wool, at £23,000,000. It is said that, taking the whole of Australia, each colonist has already reclaimed and cultivated twenty acres of land.

The exploration of the Australian interior furnishes a topic of exceeding interest. For twenty-five years after the founding of Sydney, the only known territory of the colony was a few square miles in the vicinity of Port Jackson. Going back from the coast from thirty to fifty miles, one was met everywhere by the impassable barrier of the Blue Mountains. Many perilous and some fatal attempts were made to discover a practicable pass over their craggy sides and among their yawning caverns. We have noted the discovery at last of the long-sought opening, and seen how the sheep and cattle owners pressed through to ovine and bovine paradise of Bathurst Plains.

The spirit of enterprise was now fully aroused, and numerous expeditions succeeded each other, going to the north and west. Cunningham, Leichardt, Strzelecki, Eyre, Sturt, Mitchell, Oxley, Howell, and Hume, are some of the more noted names of heroic pioneers in this important but dangerous work. Almost every expedition, though encountering huge difficulties, brought back news of rich and beautiful lands discovered. Those going north had determined the existence of an immense plateau, situated almost within the tropics, where were boundless waving pastures, perennial streams, and the cooling breezes so long sighed for by the flock-owners of New South Wales. The Darling Downs, Fitzroy Downs, Mantuan Downs, etc., were names designating these "fresh fields and pastures new."

It must be remarked, however, that these early discoveries were not always what they at first promised to be. The rivers of Australia were found to have the most capricious characteristics. They ran inland, away from the ocean instead of toward it. This fact gave rise to conjectures of a vast inland sea, which some apparently authentic reports tended to confirm. But on further investigation, the sea was indiscoverable. Some of the

rivers which, when first seen, appeared competent for all that pertains to the functions of their order, on being traced downward suddenly came to an end, being drunk up by the desert. Others terminated in chains of pools or mud lakes. Some of them were found, to the dismay of the thirsty explorer, to be as salt as the ocean. They not only in these respects violated the usages of all well-behaved rivers, but sometimes, without the least apparent cause, they suddenly overflowed their banks and deluged the contiguous plains, carrying away whole herds and flocks, with their keepers, and such habitations and other products of industry as were in their neighborhood. It was a long time, even in the partially occupied region, before the inhabitants became acquainted with the ways of the gods of this new strange land.

With the exception of nautical surveys along the coast, all the explorations and discoveries, previous to 1840, were confined to the south-eastern section of Australia, comprising perhaps less than one sixth of the whole island-continent. The interior was still a great mysterious unknown, to which fancy attributed a dubious and rather unearthly character. It was full of perils, and impenetrable to any but braver or better furnished men than had yet appeared in the colonies. But the spirit of adventure was by this time pretty thoroughly aroused, and the desire to penetrate the interior and to possess its secrets, was becoming more intense.

In 1844 Captain Sturt, whose former efforts we have seen crowned with the most profitable results, organized an expedition to seek the center. It consisted of sixteen men, with the requisite animals, provisions, and implements. He went from Adelaide, taking the eastern side of Lake Torrens, and passing up the Murray and Darling rivers. Leaving the latter at its junction with what is now known as the Menindie, he struck off toward the north. The country soon began to assume an inhospitable appearance. The party toiled painfully across a hot sandy desert. "The iron yokes of the bullocks became so hot that they could not be placed on the animals for fear of burning them. When a breeze sprang up, it felt like the scorching blaze of a mighty furnace." But this direful desert had its limits, or, at least, its interruptions. They reached a well watered, fertile, and picturesque spot, which was named Rocky Glen. They stopped a few days to recruit the men and horses. In the mean time, Sturt explored the country beyond,

to ascertain the best northern route. He soon found there was no such route; the country beyond was an absolute desert. The increasing heat was drying up the water and herbage in the vicinity; and already their retreat was cut off, as the streams and pools in their rear had utterly disappeared.

They were imprisoned in Rocky Glen for six months. Not a drop of rain fell all this time, and none had fallen for two months before. The heat was so intense that they were obliged to excavate an underground chamber to screen them from its power. The pool was drying up; vegetation "became mere snuff;" scurvy attacked the party; and one man, the second in command, was dying, indeed did die soon after relief came. But just in the last extremity rain fell. It enabled the party to proceed. About fifty miles further on an eligible halting-place was found. From this, two sustained efforts were made to reach the center. The first was in a north-west direction. Crossing a dark green plain of samphire bushes, dotted with the dry beds of small salt lagoons of sparkling white, they next encountered a series of ridges of a fiery red color, rising one after another like gigantic waves, "on the summit of which the sand lay like crests of snowy foam." These parallel ridges, fifty or sixty feet high, and appearing together like a suddenly congealed ocean, are characteristic of considerable spaces in the interior of Australia.

Beyond, there lay an immense stony desert. "Neither herb nor shrub protruded through the firmly-wedged quartz fragments, . . . and the dray-wheels and hoofs of the horses left not the least impression on the plain. All that could attract or sustain animal and vegetable life Nature seems to have rigidly excluded from this scene of desolation." After this came a wide earthy plain, on the surface of which there was no vegetation, and not even a stone. Its appearance, as described by Sturt, was that of "a boundless plowed field, on which floods had settled and subsided." This gave place to the succession of tall sand ridges again. Men and horses were nearly exhausted, when, a little further on, they came to Eyre's Creek, which afforded good water and grass for the horses. Beyond this they found the same dreary deserts stretching before them. Both men and horses were too weak to proceed further. They were four hundred miles from their last depot, and no reliable

water on the way, except Eyre's Creek, fifty miles in their rear. But they made good their retreat.

Starting again, he took a route further to the west, hoping to avoid the stony desert, the mud plains, and dismal ridges. After seven days' travel he came upon the banks of a fine flowing stream, watering an extensive tract of pastoral country, now known as Cooper's Creek, recently associated with the melancholy fate of Burke and Wills, the first that passed through the interior from ocean to ocean. Beyond this, however, recurred the adamantine desert and the inhospitable plains he was so anxious to avoid. Again baffled, he reluctantly retreated. He had gained some important information useful to future explorers, though from its partial nature calculated to produce wrong impressions. It cost much labor and suffering, as indeed have all the valuable explorations of the continent. Sturt's furthest point was about one hundred and fifty miles from the center.

The same year in which Sturt was making his perilous journey, an important expedition was undertaken by Dr. Leichardt from Moreton Bay to Port Essington, on the Gulf of Carpentaria. This expedition, though adding nothing to the knowledge of the interior, was valuable in its results. The party went three thousand miles, experiencing the usual vicissitudes of explorers, passing through hot deserts, almost dying of thirst, encountering wildernesses of scrub and rough, rocky mountain ranges, attacked by savages who killed one of the party and wounded others, almost famishing for want of food, but at last, when ready to perish, reaching the colony on the further coast. They had discovered large reaches of fertile and fruitful territory, well wooded and watered, comprising some of the most delightful and salubrious regions in the world, and capable of supporting an immense population.

The gallant leader of this expedition soon after undertook another more formidable enterprise, namely, an attempt to cross the continent from east to west. He plunged into the interior wilds more than sixteen years ago, and has never been heard from since. His fate is one of the mysteries of that mysterious region, which may never be solved.

The fatal disaster resulting to so many of the explorers, and the pitiless perils to which all were subject, together with the

unpromising account brought from the interior by Sturt and others, gave a check to the enthusiasm for inland explorations. Little more was done in this direction till 1860. We ought doubtless to except Mr. Gregory's Victoria River * Expedition on the north-west coast in 1855. Following this important river up to its source as far as latitude $18^{\circ} 12'$, Mr. Gregory found himself on the summit of a dividing range similar to that near the east coast. Proceeding down the inland slope, he passed through a desolate tract, but came upon a stream flowing toward the interior. On its banks for a hundred miles the land "consisted of vast plains of rich soil covered with beautiful grass." After this the country deteriorated till the stream terminated in a chain of dry salt lakes, beyond which was an impassable desert. Turning his course to the east, he crossed over to Gulf Carpentaria, and thence by Leichardt's old route to Sydney. Gregory went as far as $20^{\circ} 16'$ south latitude, and stopped about as far short of the center on the north as Sturt did on the south. Mr. F. T. Gregory, a brother of the above, has recently made another expedition from a point on the coast about midway between the mouth of Victoria River and Swan River. In this expedition he discovered immense regions of valuable territory, some of which by this time is doubtless being occupied by a thriving new colony.

Within the last four years the work of exploration has gone forward with extraordinary vigor. It is true, the former heroic efforts had so nearly effected the solution of the territorial problem, that less enterprise and endurance than had been manifested in them were requisite to prove their exceeding value. In 1860 Mr. M'Donall Stuart, who had been a companion of Sturt in his search for the center, and had also, with two attendants, laid open a region to the north of Spencer's Gulf, comprising eighteen hundred square miles of valuable territory well supplied with water and covered with luxuriant vegetation, started from Adelaide to go directly across the continent. He pursued a route from Chambers's Creek to the west of that of Sturt. The country as he went on was found to be for the most part very fine. There were ranges

* This is not to be confounded with the Victoria River of Mitchell and others in the south-eastern interior.

of hills with grass growing on their sides and abounding in springs of water, and plains fertile and well watered. A journey of six weeks, with comparatively few hardships, brought him to the long coveted center. The occasion was celebrated by planting a flag on an elevation close by, which was named Central Mount Stuart.

Beyond the center the old difficulties recurred. Dense belts of scrub and a scarcity of water drove them back three times. A new course was tried, but in this they were met by hostile savages and obliged to retire. Stuart's extreme northern point was $18^{\circ} 47'$. It will be recollected that Gregory, coming from the north, had reached lat. $20^{\circ} 16'$, so that they had overlapped each other by a degree and a half. It is not improbable that the tracks of the two explorers came within a short distance of each other, even if they did not intersect. The continent was practically crossed, though not from one direction. Nothing daunted, Mr. Stuart the next year made another attempt to get through to the northern coast. This time he had reached within ninety miles of the northern coast.

A third time, and immediately after his second return, he went over the same now familiar ground, and after many efforts he succeeded, by a detour sixty miles to the west, in forcing a passage through the scrub. It brought him into an interesting country. There were plains covered with luxuriant grass, "often reaching above the shoulders of the men," a picturesque diversity of hill and dale, woodland and river, a profuse tropical vegetation upon a rich deep soil. Through this he emerged on the coast of the great Indian Sea.

But before this the great problem of a central route had been solved by the expedition of Burke and Willis, which terminated so disastrously and fatally. It was organized at Melbourne in the latter part of 1860. There were five explorers, with ten European and three Sepoy attendants, and twenty-seven camels, with horses and wagons. There was a difficulty between the leader and some of his subordinates soon after starting, which led to the return of the latter. At Menindie Creek the company was divided: one party remaining with a part of the camels and stores to come on afterward; and the other going on to Cooper's Creek, the furthest eligible inland station. Having rested here and made all due preparation,

and leaving Mr. Brahe and a part of the advance division of the expedition in camp, with a depot of stores, to wait the coming up of the rear division, Mr. Burke, Mr. Wills, and two men, King and Gray, with six camels and one horse, and three months' provision, went on toward the north. This was on the 16th of December, 1860. They appear to have made their way meeting with the usual difficulties, but undergoing no extraordinary trials for six or seven weeks, when they reached the valley of the Clancary or Flinders, following down which they were conducted through much rich country to the marshes bordering on the Gulf of Carpentaria. The journals kept by the leaders of the expedition were necessarily imperfect, being only memoranda in many places from which they alone could have recalled the full account of their discoveries. They had left their camels and horse twenty-five miles from the mouth of the Flinders, and walked down till they reached a salt marsh, crossing which they came to a channel full of sea-water, and then moved "slowly down three miles to camp." It is hardly probable that they saw the open sea, but it is fully evident that they were in its immediate vicinity.

They lost one of the men, Gray, and some of the camels. They returned by the same route to their depot at Cooper's Creek after an absence of four months and five days. They had only two camels left. Their sole remaining provision was a pound and a half of dried meat. Nearly famished and almost utterly exhausted, to their amazement they found the camp deserted! For some unaccountable reason the reserve party at Menindie had not come up. Brahe, hearing nothing from either section of the expedition, had determined to retreat. What makes it the more aggravating, in this as in two other instances which we shall note, the connections only failed by a slight interval. On opening the cache they found provisions, and a note informing them that Brahe had left only seven hours before! Then came a series of other errors strangely and fatally coincident. After resting four or five days they closed up the cache, leaving in it a note for any of the other party who might afterward return; but they neglected to leave any outward mark to indicate the fact. Then, instead of going down the route by which they had come from Menindie, they struck out in a new direction. Had they gone

down the old track they would have met the reserve party coming up.

The latter party arrived in the camp, but by the same fatality did not open the cache, and so learned nothing of the whereabouts and condition of the leaders. The latter broke down after a few days from sheer exhaustion. Both their camels died. Discouraged from continuing the attempt to get through to South Australia, just when they were perhaps within fifty miles of the settlements, and more than that from Cooper's Creek, they crept back to the latter place. They were utterly worn out. First Burke, then Wills died, and King was left alone in the wilderness. He was fortunate enough, however, to attract the sympathy of the natives, among whom he managed to subsist till rescued by the relief partly sent out under Mr. Howitt.

When the uncertainty occasioned by the long-continued absence of these explorers deepened into anxiety, and the anxiety became painful, earnest efforts were made in the several colonies to ascertain their fate or afford them relief. Three expeditions were dispatched in 1861 in search of the missing party. That under Mr. A. W. Howitt was successful in discovering the disastrous results of the former enterprise. Mr. Howitt found King among the Cooper's Creek natives, and from him learned the whole interesting, but melancholy story. He also recovered the remains of the leaders and returned with them to the colony.

Mr. Landsborough and a well-equipped party were sent round by water to the Gulf of Carpentaria to make an exploration from the north. At the same time a company, under Mr. Walker, was to proceed from Rockingham Bay, on the east coast, to cross the head of the gulf. Landsborough's party was conveyed in a little brig up the Albert River about twenty miles, where a depot was formed. Following their instructions, they proceeded south-westerly toward Stuart's Central Mount. They succeeded in attaining a distance of two hundred miles from the coast, and had passed through what was on the whole a promising country, well deserving the name previously given to one of its districts, "The Plains of Promise," but they were compelled to retire by the "threatening aspect of the natives."

At the depot on the Albert, Landsborough found that

Walker had safely arrived from the east coast, bringing intelligence that he had come upon the tracks of Burke's party at the River Flinders. Landsborough immediately adopted a new course. Going up the Flinders, which he estimated to be five hundred miles long, he crossed a low dividing range, and a journey of about twenty miles brought him to the headwaters of the Thompson, flowing southerly. On this stream they found that some colonists from Queensland had already preceded them in search of pastoral stations. Hence they made their way to the Barcoo, but were diverted by the drouth prevailing at the south-west from pushing through to Victoria, and so went by the way of the Darling and New South Wales.

M'Kinlay left Adélaide in August, 1861. He went in a northerly direction, and was six weeks in getting beyond the furthest settlements of the colony, which now extended four hundred miles into the interior. Beyond these he found some reaches of arid desert; but a very large proportion of the country passed through abounded in streams and sheets of water, and was clothed with luxuriant grass. It is probable that in other seasons of the year, and indeed at the same season in other years, it may present a less promising appearance. After this they traversed Stur's stony desert, now considerably contracted in the dimensions assigned to it in former reports, and emerged again into grassy and well-watered plains, varied with mountainous and picturesque scenery. A journey of a little less than nine months brought them to the mouth of Leichardt River, on the coast of Carpentaria. Instead of returning by the same route, the party struck off to the east, reaching Port Denison, the northernmost of the sea-coast settlements in Queensland. This expedition acquired much valuable information, and settled some doubtful questions concerning the interior.

There have been other minor expeditions important in their results. The continent has now been crossed some six or eight times since the beginning of 1860, and the principal mysteries have been cleared up. There are doubtless still large tracts of which nothing is known, but enough has been ascertained to enable us to form a pretty accurate estimate of the general character of the country.

The notion formerly prevailing that the whole interior was

one vast desert is now exploded. There are wide regions of perpetual desolation, but there are probably still wider ones of almost perpetual fertility. Then, again, there are extensive tracts which are exposed to the extremes of flood and drouth, and these are under the control of capricious influences, or hitherto incalculable laws. But there is reason to believe that the greater part of the country will soon be overspread with pastoral settlements. The probability is that the season of severest suffering in one region are not generally the same in those even adjacent; hence the colonies and districts may support each other, and in time means may be found to remedy the adverse physical peculiarities of the different sections.

The climate of Australia is of a favorable character, and appears for the most part to agree remarkably well with European constitutions. We have already alluded to the severe drouths to which the country is liable. It is also subject to extraordinary transitions of temperature. In the dryness of the atmosphere it is said to resemble Spain. There is less variation of the climate than might be inferred from the extent of the continent. Even the tropical regions are less subject to intense heat than many other regions of the same latitude; while the southerly portions, owing to the occasional hot winds blowing across the interior burning deserts, have frequently a high temperature. There is some conflict of testimony as to the effect of the climate on the longevity of emigrants; but we incline to the opinion that though the climatic change is great to those going either from Europe or America, the consequences are less deleterious than in any other exchange of residence of which we have ever known. In many instances the change has been remarkably beneficial, and even invalids and aged persons seem to have recovered their health and their youth. The statistics of mortality in the British army illustrates the climatic effect. In the West Indies the average mortality is over ten per cent. In Jamaica it is over fourteen per cent.; while throughout the Australian stations it is as low as one half per cent.

Not only does the country and the climate agree with the human species of other and distant nativity, but nearly all the lower animals, as well as vegetables of foreign origin, take most kindly to the new circumstances and thrive beyond all expectation.

The fauna of Australia seems to have been exceedingly meager and inferior, though curious. The kangaroo, of which there are nearly a hundred species, is the largest animal. The dingo, or native dog, is the most mischievous. We have already seen how sheep and cattle flourish and multiply, becoming immediately from the first a source of immense wealth. Horses, hogs, and almost every other kind of domestic beast, as well as fowls, improve and rapidly increase their kind here. The llama, or alpaca of Peru, has lately been introduced. Mr. Ledger, at much expense and with great difficulty, originated this enterprise. The government of Peru prohibited the exportation of the animals, but he collected about eight hundred of them, drove them across the Andes, and shipped them to New South Wales. At first a number of them died, but they have now become acclimatized, and, like the other imported animals, are multiplying rapidly. It is estimated that within a few years the clip of llama wool will exceed fifty million pounds in weight. The great value of this product is well known.

The agricultural resources of Australia are as yet scarcely begun to be developed. Till within the last half dozen years comparatively little attention has been given to them. The raising of stock and growing of wool, occupations so immensely lucrative, and more latterly the absorbing attraction of the mineral deposits, have diverted the minds of the people from the wealth of the soil. Add to this the preposterous land-system, which has prevented the securing of moderate farms, and has every way tended to discourage the agricultural interest. But of late it has become evident that there are in Australia vast regions of almost unsurpassed farming country, and that with comparatively little labor and care nearly all the most valuable articles of produce in the United States and in Europe can be grown here with great profit. Wheat, corn, barley, potatoes, millet, rye, oats and English grasses are becoming largely cultivated; also indigo, (which is indigenous,) arrow-root, tea, coffee, and ginger; while tobacco, sugar, and cotton, the three great slave-grown articles of commerce, it is confidently asserted can be secured in the largest quantities by Europeans on the shores of the Pacific. The notion has prevailed in this country, and scarcely less in England, that these articles could not safely and profitably be cultivated by white

labor. This opinion is, however, now nearly exploded, and especially so far as Australia is concerned. Recent investigations and observations demonstrate that even in the tropical districts of that continent persons of European nativity and descent work as freely and with as little risk in the open air as in the climate of the temperate zone. It is also proved in other portions of that country, as it has been elsewhere, that free, well-fed, high-priced English labor is, under fair circumstances of competition, more profitable than cheap African or Asiatic labor; of course, in the long run, far more profitable than slave labor.

Tobacco is indigenous to the soil, and plants of great luxuriance have been found along the banks of some of the New South Wales rivers. The manufactured article has been pronounced superior to that of America. The sugar-cane has been tried somewhat extensively, and the experiment is so far successful as to induce great numbers to enter upon its culture, to which there are extensive tracts adapted. On the Clarence River, two degrees south of Brisbane, the canes have yielded four tons of sugar to the acre.

In the colony of Queensland there is probably a region nearly as large as the present cotton-producing section of our own land which is particularly adapted to the production of that, at the present time, so important staple. The sea-island cotton, which is here confined to a narrow belt of coast of no great extent, is there found in great luxuriance, and is perhaps indigenous. It has this advantage over the American plant, in that, while the latter has to be renewed every year, the shrubs of the former continue to improve up to the third and fourth year. The Manchester Chamber of Commerce, reporting on the samples of this cotton, says, they are "far superior to cotton from any other part of the world." It has been declared authoritatively that from this cotton "yarn could be produced finer than any that could be manufactured in India or Great Britain."

But it is well known that the demand for this more costly variety is not so great as for the shorter staple, or New Orleans variety. Whether the latter, which is a more profitable crop in our southern states than the higher-priced article, can be as profitably cultivated in Queensland, is a problem not yet fully solved. The prospects of engaging in the culture of the coarser

descriptions are, however, not unfavorable. But whatever may be done there or elsewhere, we do not apprehend that our own country is likely to suffer from the development in Australia of this important branch of agriculture and commerce, especially under the now almost certain improvement of our own industrial system.

Upon the mineral wealth of Australia we need say but little, for the reason that thousands who know nothing else about the country know that it is a land of gold to which multitudes have resorted from many countries, our own included, to gather the rich spoil. It is now nearly thirteen years since the discovery of the gold fields. The first were found by a Mr. Hargreaves, in the Bathurst district, in New South Wales. He had lived several years in the vicinity, but had left the colony and gone to California when the precious metal was discovered there. Returning, he was struck with the resemblance of the geological formation in his own neighborhood to that of California. He commenced searching for gold, which he was not long in discovering. About four months after still richer deposits were found in the colony of Victoria. Gold fields have since been discovered, though none so rich or extensive as the two named, in various parts of the continent. With the important and remarkable consequences of this discovery all are familiar, for it has been the same there substantially as in our own country.

Besides gold, there are valuable iron mines; also mines of tin, lead, and especially of copper. Extensive beds of coal, too, have been brought to light, and have proved veritable mines of wealth to their proprietors.

The aborigines of Australia are almost unanimously described by all writers on the subject as the lowest and most degraded of the human family. They are inferior in feature and figure to the Africans; of a dark earth-brown color; "with sloe-black savage eyes widely set against their high cheek bones, and under protruding bushy black eyebrows; with distended nostrils, wide mouth, broad pouting lips, matted long black hair, shrunken frame, long thin arms, short outspread feet, spindle-legs, bedaubed and greased from head to foot, and without decency and without shame." These are the most general characteristics, though there is a considerable variety in the different tribes, some of them being more brave and

warlike than others. They have hitherto persistently withstood all attempts to civilize and Christianize them. Their numbers have been variously estimated at from two hundred thousand to four hundred thousand. But whether more or less, they are rapidly diminishing, and in not many years they will probably have wholly disappeared before the superior race, following the universal law.

We have sketched the history and character of Australia without much reference to the neighboring islands of New Zealand and Tasmania, either of which is large enough for two or three European kingdoms, besides some smaller but still important colonies. But we may easily see here the elements of a mighty Anglo-Saxon empire forming on the other side of the world, in countries rich in natural resources and with superior facilities for commerce. Within a very few years there will be ten or twelve great and populous colonies, each enjoying the chief features of popular sovereignty, yet still recognizing dependence on the mother country. That this dependence will be perpetuated is scarcely reasonable to expect; and the probability is that by the time another century opens an independent Anglo-Saxon nation, the Confederate Republic of Australasia, will be among the mighty and influential powers of the earth.

ART. VII.—CHRISTOLOGY.

THE doctrine of Christ is at once the most important and the most inscrutable that was ever made the subject of human thought. It is the most important because it comprehends not only the doctrine of God, but of God in his several manifestations of mercy in behalf of our race; the most inscrutable, because it involves the mysteries not only of Godhead and manhood, but of these multiplied into each other by the union of the two natures in one person.

The pre-existent Logos; the humanity with parentage ineffably mysterious; the Logos and humanity constituting one

personality; this person, capable alike of being tempted and of succoring them that are tempted; of weeping at the grave of a friend, and of raising that friend from the dead; of dying himself, and yet able to "destroy him that hath the power of death;" whose life was a miracle not only of wisdom and power, but of tenderness and love: such a person is the product of no human thought or philosophy, but the "Son of God with power."

The doctrine of Jesus is thus stated: "Thou shalt bring forth a son and shalt call his name Jesus." Although this was the name by which he was called, both in childhood and manhood, by those who knew him only as a man, yet we dare not say that *Jesus* was a *personal* designation of his humanity, because this might imply that there were two *persons* to be united instead of two *natures*. But whether personal or official, it was the name selected for Mary's son, for that which should be born of her. If it should be contended that the *act* of incarnation did not take place at the birth, but previously, it would not necessarily nor probably follow that more than humanity was born of the virgin; for if God, the Logos, might "forsake" Jesus during the agonies of the crucifixion, might he not also at his birth? Our persons are formed by the union of soul and body; and as the death of the body, and its consequent long sleep in the grave, do not make it necessary that the soul should sleep there with it, in order to maintain the integrity of the person, so the humanity of Christ, whether it be in the womb of the virgin or cold (that is, the *body* of it) in the tomb, belongs as much to the *person* of the Son of God as when the glory of the manifested presence makes his "face to shine as the sun, and his raiment white as the light." I think, therefore, we may safely affirm that nothing but the humanity of Christ was born of the virgin. Mary was the mother of Jesus, not of God. She is called the mother of Jesus, but not of Christ. Strictly speaking, therefore, Jesus is the proper name for all of Christ that is human, though without doubt it is sometimes used, by an interchange of appellations between the two natures, to designate the entire personality, as are vine, servant, and other names which are not at all appropriate in respect of his divinity.

We cannot well overestimate the importance of the doctrine

of the pure, essential humanity of Christ. Without this there could be no proper body for sacrifice, as will appear in the sequel. But to ascribe super-humanity to Jesus, to make him the "Son of God" simply because he was begotten by the Holy Ghost, is both a radical and an inexcusable error. For why should a man begotten of the virgin by the Holy Ghost be superhuman, any more than a woman taken from the side of a man by the same power? or than the first man, who was created by a still more direct exercise of divine power, and consequently with less intervention of secondary causes? What, therefore, was above humanity, as developed in the life of Jesus, was not because of the miraculous conception, but because the "Logos was made flesh." Nor was the flesh any less, nor any more flesh, because the Logos was united with it. And such clearly is the Scripture doctrine; for it is said, "that as the children were partakers of flesh and blood, he also took part of the *same*." The son of Mary, therefore, was essentially human, and his name was called *Jesus*.

But the son of Mary, by an interchange of appellations, is also called the "Son of God." I say by an *interchange of appellations*; for neither the *character* of that humanity, nor the *mode* by which it took its existence, entitles it, any more than Adam, to be designated the Son of God. But if it be replied that both are so called, this of itself is sufficient to show that in respect to Christ it is not chiefly in view of the reason above stated, because this would make it no longer true that he is the *only begotten* Son of God, which he is declared to be. Both Calvin and Watson maintain that the title "Son of God" is a *personal* designation of the Divine *nature*, and that the Sonship was just as much a fact before the incarnation as after it—that Jesus was called the son of God, not because of the miraculous conception, but on account of the Deity and eternal existence of the Logos which was incarnated. And this view of the question is well sustained by the fact that neither Jesus nor his disciples ever claimed that he was the Son of God on the ground of the miraculous conception. In regard to Christ, it was a fact he never mentioned; and in respect to the disciples, they doubtless were ignorant of it; for this was one of the things which Mary kept and pondered secretly in her heart. It has been held by some that Luke i, 35, "The

Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God," proves that the title "Son" was given to Christ, either with reference to the miraculous conception of the human nature, or with reference to the *act* of incarnation. But it should be remembered that he was called the Son of God because the power of the Highest overshadowed the virgin, which is distinct from the fact that his humanity was formed in her womb immediately by God. Mr. Watson holds that the effect of this overshadowing would be the assumption of humanity by the divine nature of him who is, in that nature, *the Son*; but that he is so called, not because a divine person assumed humanity, but because that divine person was antecedently the Son of God.

The doctrine of the Logos is clearly stated by John. Of his discourse on this subject the following may be taken as a correct syllabus: "The Logos was in the beginning, was with God, and was God; and the Logos was made flesh and dwelt among us." Here are two facts distinctly stated, namely: 1. The essential divinity of a pre-existent person called the Logos; and, 2. That this Logos was made flesh. To fathom the first is to fathom divinity and determine the conditions of existence that is underived and that never began to be. The explication of the second will fall more properly under another division of the subject.

The doctrine of Christ seems to be stated in these words: "The Logos was made flesh"—"God was manifest in the flesh." The word *made* in the first thesis evidently is qualified and limited by the word *manifest* in the second. For the divinity was no more made flesh according to the usual acceptation of the word, than the flesh was made divinity. To lose either nature in the other is to fail of the end proposed in the union of the two. We conclude, therefore, that the words "made flesh" and "manifest in the flesh" denote that inexplicable union in one person of the Godhead and manhood—of the Son of God and the son of Mary. And I will assume that this person is not so well represented by any other name as that of Christ. "Son of God," it is true, is a *personal* designation of the divine nature, and as appropriate after the incarnation as before it, and no more so; and hence it is, per-

haps, that in the use of this title we lose sight somewhat of the humanity of the Saviour, as we do not when we use the word Christ, which, though it be an official title, never realized the object for which it stood until it found the Godhead and manhood united in one person. But while there was a Son of God before, *there was no Christ* until the incarnation; therefore no other word can so well symbolize the union of the two natures, whereof is one Christ, as this we have named.

At this point we present the decision of the Council of Chalcedon in the fifth century: "That in Christ there is *one person*; in the unity of the person *two natures*, the divine and the human; and that there is no change, or mixture, or confusion of these two natures, but that each retains its own distinguishing properties." With this formula agrees the Athanasian creed: "Perfect God and perfect man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting—who, although he be God and man, yet he is not two, but *one Christ*: one, not by the conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking the manhood into God; one altogether, not by confusion of substance, but by unity of person; for as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is *one Christ*." The creed of our own Church, copied almost *verbatim* from that of the Church of England, comports most happily with those ancient symbols of believers in Christ. "The Son, who is the Word of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father, took man's nature in the womb of the blessed virgin; so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and manhood, were joined together in one person, never to be divided, whereof is *one Christ*, very God and very man."

At the union of these two natures the name Logos is dropped as no longer applicable to the new personality. Christ is never called the Logos, and the Logos is never called Christ. As at present existing, we are not at liberty to think of the Logos separately from humanity—Christ is never to be divided. Now whatever is the difference between the Logos and the Logos made flesh, is the difference between the Logos and Christ. Christ is the Logos and something more; namely, that which was born of the virgin united with the Logos. And as until the incarnation there was no Christ, no union of the Godhead and manhood, whereof is *one Christ*, so after that event, though

the Logos remained, the union of God with man, forming a new hypostasis, rendered that name (we speak reverently) inadequate to describe the person as now existing. To call the person Christ the Logos is to affirm the divinity of Christ's humanity, because that humanity helps to constitute the personality. To constitute such a personality each nature is essential; and whatever is done or suffered by either nature is done and suffered by the person Christ; and whatever is affirmed of either nature is affirmed of the person, to the extent that each nature constitutes the personality. But it does not follow, nor is it true, that what is done and suffered by and affirmed of each nature is done and suffered by and affirmed of the other also. The two natures, though united, are distinct—they are neither mixed nor blended.

This person is divine; the character of the personality being determined by and in favor of the higher nature, which is a divine nature. Or, perhaps, to speak with greater theological accuracy, we should say that *impersonal* humanity was taken up by the hypostatic union into the *person* of the Son of God, and this person is divine. But because this person is divine, we may not hence conclude that he is all divinity—he is humanity as well. This subject finds, perhaps, its most adequate illustration in the hypostatical union of the human soul and body. Man is a spiritual being, yet he is not all spirit; he is also said to be mortal, yet the better part of him never dies. So we say that Christ was born and that he died, but we do not understand either that divinity was born or that it could die; and though truly enough affirmed, it is true only in so far as humanity constitutes the person Christ. Christ suffered death, but clearly he suffered it in his human nature. We therefore broadly distinguish between *this* nature of the divine person and the divine nature of that person.

If it be true that both the divine and human natures are essential in order to constitute the person Christ, it will follow that if either the Godhead or manhood be taken away the person would no longer exist. Take away the divinity, and we have a man; take away the manhood, and we have the Logos; unite the two, and we have the divine person Christ; yet not all of that person is God, though the Godhead constitutes by far the greater part of the personality. To affirm compre-

hensively of the whole person Christ that he is God, is to affirm the divinity of his humanity. But the apostle says, not that Christ is God, but that "Christ is God's." If the person Christ be God, then the blood of God was shed, and God suffered and died. The difference between God and Christ is precisely the difference, whatever that may be, there is between the God and "God manifest in the flesh." Christ is not usually called God, but the "Son of God." In those instances where he is called "God," "The mighty God," "The everlasting Father," it is as evident that respect is had to his divinity, as that his humanity alone is intended when he is presented to our minds as a "child born," a "Son given," and is called "vine," "door," and "servant." The chemistry which thus resolves this person into his primary or constituent elements is divine. The laboratory is the Bible. And we trust we have not presumed to take upon ourselves the high office of determining anything beyond what is written therein, or fairly deducible therefrom.

Christ, says the Athanasian symbol, is *one*; one, not by confusion of substance, but by *unity* of person. In respect to personality, Christ is undivided. In a good sense Christ was born in Bethlehem, and grew in stature, and in favor with God and man. It was Christ who was tempted, and it is Christ who is able to succor them that are tempted. It was Christ who wept at the grave of Lazarus, and it was he who raised Lazarus from the dead. It was Christ who died, and it was Christ who plucked the sting from death, and robbed the grave of its victory. And, blessed be God! it is Christ who ever liveth to make intercession for us.

But from this absolute unity of personality it does not follow that we may not refer the things said of and done by Christ, some to one nature and some to the other. The doctrine of unity is not at all contravened by saying that *this* affirmation made by Christ refers to his divine nature, and *that* to his human nature; that Godhead did *this*, and that manhood suffered *that*; for what the Godhead did was done by Christ, and what the manhood suffered was suffered by Christ. Take the passage already referred to, Isaiah ix, 6: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given: his name shall be called The mighty God, The everlasting Father."

Now as it was only the humanity that was born of the virgin, so of Christ it is the divine nature alone that can sustain the wondrous names,—The mighty God, The everlasting Father. The same necessity is upon us of distinguishing between the natures of Christ, if we consider what he did and suffered, and what he said concerning himself. Take, for example, his temptation. The doctrine of the “unity of the person” justifies the declaration that Christ was tempted; and yet we have the authority of an apostle for saying that God cannot be tempted of evil, neither tempteth he any man. In the temptation, therefore, we must count out the divine nature, and the humanity of Christ, as exposed to it, is what there is remaining. Take again those two declarations of Christ concerning himself: “I and my Father are one”—“My Father is greater than I.” Now it is philosophically impossible that any essence should be one with and yet inferior to the same thing. But what is affirmed is true of Christ, because in the unity of his person there is not oneness or confusion of substance, but two dissimilar natures, concerning which, as in this case, opposite things, and things seemingly in conflict, may be truly and justly affirmed. In respect to his divine nature Christ and his Father were one—the “Logos was God;” but his humanity alone being regarded, and his Father was greater than he. Christ wept at the grave of Lazarus; but can the divine nature weep? On the cross Christ exclaimed, “My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?” Did the divine nature join with the human in this cry? or can divinity forsake itself? Christ died on the cross; but did the divine Logos die? Who would hesitate to say that Christ suffered death on the cross? And yet who would claim that he suffered it in more than his human nature? Again Christ is declared to be both the “root and offspring of David”—“David’s Lord and David’s son.” Of the undivided person, Christ, this is strictly true; but it is true only of his divinity that he is David’s root and Lord, as it is true only of his humanity that he is the offspring and son of David.

This just distinction, and method of interpretation based upon it, have had the almost unanimous support of the great masters in theology. “Does any one ask,” says Mr. Watson, “if Jesus Christ was truly God, how he could be born and die?

how his soul could be exceeding sorrowful even unto death?" be "forsaken of his father?" purchase the Church with "his own blood?" etc., etc. The answer is, that he was also *man*. If, on the other hand, it be a matter of surprise that a *visible man* should heal diseases at his will, and without referring to any higher authority, as he often did, be associated with the Father in solemn ascriptions of glory and thanksgiving, and bear even the awful names of God, names of description and revelation, names which express divine attributes, what is the answer? The only hypothesis explanatory of all these statements is, that Christ is God as well as man. He says again, "This distinction is expressed, in modern theological language, by considering some things which are spoken of Christ as said of his divine, others of his human nature; and he who takes this principle of interpretation along with him will seldom find any difficulty in apprehending the sense of the sacred writers, though the subjects themselves be often, to human minds, inscrutable." Says Bishop Burnet, "A man is called tall, fair, and healthy, from the state of his body; and learned, wise, and good, from the qualities of his mind: so Christ is called holy, harmless, and undefiled; is said to have died, risen, and ascended up into heaven, with relation to his human nature: he is also said to be in 'the form of God, to have created all things, to be the brightness of his Father's glory, and the express image of his person,' with relation to his divine nature." Calvin, Knapp, and others might be quoted to the same effect; but Paul, a greater than any of these, makes precisely this distinction, when he says of Christ, that he was "made of the seed of David *according to the flesh*." The objection that this view of the subject *divides* Christ, is quite too shallow to merit a labored reply. We see in a piece of machinery, for instance, iron and wood combined; we say that the iron is used for this purpose, and the wood for that; but we do not have to separate them, nor divide nor destroy the machinery in order to distinguish between their properties, and the uses to which those properties are put. It is thus we are compelled to distribute to the two natures of Christ the properties belonging to each, rendering to God the things that are God's, and to humanity the things belonging to humanity, not failing to observe mean-

time that, by the conditions of this wonderful union, the things belonging both to God and man belong to Jesus Christ our Lord.

In the light of this subject the question, Did the divine nature participate in the sufferings of Christ? is easily answered. If it be meant, Did the divine sympathize with the human? the fact of the union of the two is sufficient to demonstrate, not only sympathy with this nature, but with all the race which this is to redeem. But if it be intended to ask whether the divine nature *suffered* by this sympathy, one might assert even dogmatically, if it were necessary, that it did not and could not. So far as we know, suffering implies weakness. Now since we also know that God is not weak, and have no intimation from the Scriptures that he suffered or can suffer, he is indeed a poor Baconian, and a reckless theological adventurer, who, in the face of so broad an induction, would argue against all parity of reason, that the divine nature suffered in the person of Christ. We have no patience, and ought to have none, with the sickly sentimentalism and vamping theology which know no better way to make man *happy* than to make divinity *suffer*. We ought at least to be able to assume, in the discussion of this point, that no one would assert such suffering on the part of the divine nature of Christ, unless he was convinced that the exigencies of the case demanded it; for there are few minds so unappreciative that they will not find the scenes of the cross and Calvary sufficiently tragic without adding fiction to facts. But not only do these exigencies *not* demand such suffering, but the nature of the case forbids that it should be.

The penalty of the law is *death*, and not suffering, only as the former involves the latter. Much that Christ suffered, we dare not try to determine how much was intended to qualify *him* for the work of his priesthood. The necessity for this terrible discipline involves a mystery too deep for our feeble comprehension. Nor should we dare to tread this road at all had not an apostle, guided by the light of inspiration, gone before us. Paul says: "It became him in bringing many sons unto glory to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through *sufferings*"—"For in that he himself hath *suffered*, being tempted, he is able to succor them that are tempted." If the penalty consisted in both suffering and death, and it

were thought necessary that the divine nature should suffer in order to make atonement, would it not appear just as necessary, and for the same reasons precisely, that that nature should *die* as well as suffer? If the penalty were suffering, the completeness of the scheme of redemption might depend on the *quantity* of those sufferings. But this is not so. The commercial idea of the atonement is now pretty much abandoned, and very justly. Declarations to the effect that Christ suffered in his person as much as would have been inflicted on the race, or even on a single soul, are derogatory to the scheme of redemption, and leave no room at all for the exercise of mercy. The Gospel offer of salvation to man goes not, therefore, on the principle of *quid pro quo*, so many grains of suffering for so many ounces of mercy scrupulously and parsimoniously weighed out, but upon the principle of substitution, the death of the innocent instead of the guilty. The penalty being death, the *suffering* of the divine nature in no way assists the human in *dying*. So far from it, that it seemed impossible for Jesus to die until God had forsaken him. It was this, and not the crucifixion, justice, and not man, that executed the penalty on the offered substitute.

It should be distinctly remarked here that the doctrine of substitution does not go upon the assumption that the acceptance of a substitute gives the law any new force, or justice any rights not previously possessed. The penalty could be inflicted only on the nature of the transgressor, or on a like nature substituted therefor. Hence "Christ took not on him the nature of angels." If he had, the lower nature in the person so constituted would have been at least one grade higher than that on which justice had claim for the sin of man. But if justice had no right to inflict penalties on angelic natures, much less had it on the divine. But now Christ took on him the seed of Abraham, that he might have whereof to offer; as it is written, "A body hast thou prepared me."

But it may be asked, Wherefore was it necessary that Christ should take on him the seed of Abraham or human nature at all? The answer is, that, so far as we can see, it was necessary because atonement without it was impossible. For where all are guilty, and alike under the same penalty, and that penalty death, it requires no argument to prove that substitution

is out of the question. But suppose we have given the manhood of Christ without the divine Logos united with it, we have now a sinless nature, and one not under the penalty, but one that is nevertheless necessarily disqualified for performing the functions of a vicar in the high sense demanded; because the nature and person are under law, the demands of which it is impossible they should ever transcend. The state of the case is plainly this: the sacrifice must be more than a creature, and in some sense less than a god. To this conclusion we never could have come had not the great mystery been enacted before us. Precisely what is needed, but what never could have been invented by any human genius, or the combined wisdom of any age, or of all ages, is plainly realized in the person of our Redeemer. In him we have the sinless nature, not under the penalty, and of the same grade or kind with that which is taken up by its union with the divinity into a higher personality than that on which the infracted law has claim. The same truths precisely which St. Paul comprehends in these words: "For such a high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and *made higher than the heavens.*" Thus the object of the incarnation seems to have been, to make it possible for humanity to suffer for humanity under, if I may so speak, the patronage of the *person* of the Son of God, to accomplish which it seems there was no other way than to take this humanity up into that divine personality. It was thus sacrifice was made possible, and super-legal merit obtained.

If now it be required, in order to our salvation, that this divine person shall suffer, to do this it will not be necessary that he should suffer in his divine nature; for, as we have already seen, whatever is done or suffered in either nature is done and suffered by the divine person Christ. Christ must suffer that man may live; but this suffering is achieved as truly by inflicting the penalty, death, on his human nature, which is of the same kind with that under the curse, and on which the law has claim, as it would by involving the divine nature in these sufferings, on which the law has no claim.

ART. VIII.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

PROTESTANTISM. *

GREAT BRITAIN.

THE ESSAYS AND REVIEWS.—The late decision of the judicial committee of the Privy Council continued to be the subject of much agitation among the members of the Church of England. The most important document which the decision has called forth was drawn up at a meeting held at Oxford on the 25th of February. This "Oxford Declaration" is to the following effect:

We, the undersigned, presbyters and deacons in holy orders of the Church of England and Ireland, hold it to be our bounden duty to the Church of England and Ireland, and to the souls of men, to declare our firm belief that the Church of England and Ireland, in common with the whole Catholic Church, maintains without reserve or qualification the inspiration or divine authority of the whole canonical Scriptures, as not only containing but being the word of God; and further teaches, in the words of our blessed Lord, that the "punishment" of the "cursed," equally with the "life" of the "righteous," is "everlasting."

The committee by whom this "Declaration" was framed consists of Dr. Clerke, Archdeacon of Oxford; Dr. Cotton, Provost of Worcester College; Archdeacon Denison; the Rev. W. R. Freemantle; Dr. Leighton, Warden of All Souls'; Dr. Miller, of Birmingham, and Dr. Pusey. This list contains the names of the leaders of both the High Churchmen and the Evangelical Party, and the majority of the clergymen of both parties hastened, consequently, to subscribe to it. There were, however, some notable exceptions. There was, first of all, a question raised respecting the lawfulness of signing it. Certain clergymen, foremost among whom stands Dr. Goode, Dean of Ripon, who agreed in principle with the "Declaration," were doubtful as to the legality of signing it, and a case was therefore prepared on the subject for the consideration and opinion of counsel. A joint opinion was obtained from Mr. A. J. Stephens, Q.C., LL.D., and Mr. J. C. Trail. The opinion sets forth that "it is evident that the declarants impeach the judgment of the judicial committee by affirming the converse of the propositions

established by the judgment; and that fact, taken in connection with the language and tenor of 'the Declaration' and its title, is open to no other reasonable construction than that of an intention on the part of the declarants not to submit to the judgment pronounced by the queen." The opinion concludes in the following terms: "Under the foregoing acts and circumstances we are of opinion that it is not consistent with the obligations under which the clergy have placed themselves by their subscription to the three articles contained in the 36th canon to sign the 'declaration' drawn up at the meeting held at Oxford on the 25th of February, 1864."

On the other hand, however, an opinion was obtained from the attorney general (Sir Roundell Palmer) and Sir Hugh Cairns, two of the ablest lawyers of the English bar, declaring that while "the observance of articles 1 and 37 will of course involve, among other things, obedience and respect to any judgment, that is, to any sentence which the sovereign may pronounce in an ecclesiastical cause, on the recommendation of the judicial committee of the Privy Council," this is "wholly distinct from an assent to or acquiescence in the reasoning or statements pursued or advanced by members of the judicial committee as the grounds of their recommendation to Her Majesty." "It is to this sentence of the sovereign, and to that alone, that the subjects of the sovereign, both lay and clerical, have to look; and it is the sentence which those who are affected by it have to obey." The two eminent jurists, therefore, hold it to be not in any way unlawful to subscribe to the Oxford Declaration.

Other parties condemned the declaration itself. One of the first among these was the Rev. F. D. Maurice, who branded it with the designation of a new test, and asserted that the agreement between the High Churchmen and the Evangelicals was only brought about by each one putting upon the words of the declaration a different meaning. He thought that even Dr. Williams and Mr. Wilson, the condemned essayists, might sign it, if they would follow such an example. This called out a declaration from Mr. Wilson, to this effect, that he

would not sign it if he could and could not if he would. A spicy correspondence also ensued between Dr. Pusey and F. D. Maurice, in the columns of the *London Times*, and both combatants, though clergymen of the same Church, came at length to the conclusion that they did not "believe in the same God." Some low churchmen opposed it, because in view of the Romanizing tendencies of the high church party they deemed it the right course of the evangelical body to stand off from any amalgamation with persons holding such dangerous opinions. High Church clergymen, on the other hand, refused their signatures because the word "presbyter" had been used instead of "priest." Nevertheless, the declaration received the signatures of some twelve thousand clergymen, a clear majority of the entire clergy of the Established Church, which in all numbers about nineteen thousand clergymen. The petition was presented by a large deputation, on May 12, to the Archbishop of Canterbury, who on this occasion was accompanied by the Bishops of Carlisle, Gloucester, and Bristol, St. Asaphs, Bangor, Rochester, Moray and Ross. The archbishop, in the name of the bishops of the United Church of England and Ireland, expressed his joy at the sentiments expressed in this declaration. It strengthened, he remarked, their conviction that the Church would never be disposed to propagate opinions tending to subvert the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. The bishops, on their part, would ever feel it to be their duty to maintain the authoritative teaching of the Church, humbly trusting to receive guidance from above.

Soon after the publication of the judgment of the Privy Council, the Archbishop of Canterbury addressed a pastoral letter to the clergy and laity of the province of Canterbury, setting forth his views respecting the decision. The archbishop states that while he would not undertake to define inspiration, he accepted the testimony of the Church that the Bible was God's word written, and therefore Dr. Williams must be wrong in saying that it is only the voice of devout reason in the congregation. As to his acquiescence in the judgment on the point bearing upon eternal punishment, he says it arose from no doubt in his own mind that the Church teaches the eternity both of rewards and of pun-

ishments, but that from the misty way in which Mr. Wilson had put his views, he doubted whether they had the meaning which the prosecutors attached to them.

In the session of the Convocation of Canterbury, which opened on the 19th of April, the subject of the Essays and Reviews came again before the bishops, in consequence of a deputation from the lower house having brought up a *gravamen*, signed by forty "dignified and benefited" clergymen, affirming that injury had been done to the Church by the delay of synodical judgment upon the subject, and that it was expedient now to proceed to such judgment. The Bishop of Oxford explained that the action of convocation with regard to this volume had slumbered since July, 1861, in consequence of the book being under the jurisdiction of the civil courts. Now that these courts had definitely and so lamentably determined the question, the authority of this convocation revived; and he proposed that they should not allow the matter to rest longer. After showing that it was in the power of this convocation to deal with the book, and even, as some lawyers thought, with the authors too, though he did not propose that, he proceeded to say that he thought the authority of the convocation would come in to supplement the defects of the Privy Council. He held that the Church had some power to deal with error, and that power was not possessed by the judicial committee of the Privy Council, which could only try the subtle forms of modern heresy by the honest literal application of ancient formularies, that had scarcely any bearing on these new heresies. A condemnation of the "Essays" by the House of Bishops, he believed, would tend, in the minds of many, to re-establish a faith which had been grievously shaken. He moved the appointment of a committee to consider and report on the subject. The Bishops of London and St. David's opposed the motion. The Bishop of St. David's said it would be better to sign a dogmatic declaration of doctrine than to undertake such work as that. He then criticised severely the Oxford Declaration, and declared that so far from considering the eleven thousand names appended to it as adding any weight to its statements, he regarded them "in the light of a row of figures preceded by a decimal point." "The declaration was a sort of moral

torture, for the adjuration employed implied that unless persons appended their names to it they were wanting in love to God and the souls of men." Such an object was "worthy of the severest reprobation." The Bishop of London deprecated any course which would oblige them to reconsider the report of the Lower House on Essays and Reviews "Of all the foul productions it had ever been the misfortune of controversy to call out, this, the production of a single individual, was the worst, and more calculated than anything he had ever seen to injure the Christian faith. He deprecated disinterring from the death an unfortunate paper which he trusted no intelligent layman of the Church had ever seen." The bishop further repudiated the notion that something ought to be done to help God to defend his truth, and echoed Dr. Thirlwall's (the Bishop of St. David's) opinion of the "melancholy" Oxford Declaration.

In May the Archbishop of York issued a pastoral to the clergy and laity of his province, in which he contends that the formularies of the Church of England assert the doctrine that the Bible is the word of God, and that the doctrine of a terminable punishment finds no countenance whatever from Holy Scripture. In conclusion, the archbishop says: "It would be vain to deny that this trouble of the Church has a real foundation. And yet, my brethren, there is no reason for immoderate fear. The Church of England depends for her teaching, not upon prosecutions and decisions of courts, but upon the solemn undertaking, freely made by her ministers, that they will teach the people according to her articles and formularies."

MAY ANNIVERSARIES.—The anniversaries of the month of May have again proved that Christian liberality in England is not on the decrease. We give below a list of the religious societies of Great Britain, and their incomes in 1863 and 1864, classifying them according to their fields of operations.

I. FOREIGN MISSIONS.

Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in	1863.	1864.
Foreign Parts.....	£93,326	£87,832
Church Missionary Soc.	131,218	154,247
Wesleyan*	141,638	134,258
London	81,924	81,072

* The Wesleyan Missionary Society reported besides promises of £170,000 for its great Jubilee Fund.

Baptist Missionary Soc.	£27,189	£24,419
United Methodist "	7,877	11,585
Primitive Meth. "	11,891	12,557
Turkish Missions, etc.	2,875

II. COLONIAL AND CONTINENTAL MISSIONS.

Colonial & Contin'l Soc.	29,771	28,919
Colonial Missionary Soc.	6,718
Foreign Aid Society....	2,418
Evangelical Contin'l Soc.	1,983

III. HOME MISSIONS.

Church Pastoral Aid Soc.	41,692	44,845
London City Mission...	36,761	42,476
Irish Church Missions.	29,724	26,672
Wesleyan Home Miss.	14,000	15,000
Home Miss. Soc. (Cong'l).	9,900	4,093
Irish Evangelical Soc.	4,015
Baptist Home Missions.	1,700	1,375
Ch. of England Scripture Readers' Society.....	10,285	11,193

IV. EDUCATIONAL SOCIETIES.

Sunday-School Union...	19,075	19,531
Ragged-School Union .	4,700	9,594
Religious Book Society.	9,450
Christian Vernacular Education Soc. for India	4,308	5,718

V. JEWISH SOCIETIES.

London Jews' Society..	32,534	32,681
British Jews' Society	6,585
Operative Jewish Conv's	4,331

VI. MISCELLANEOUS SOCIETIES.

Religious Tract Society	95,602	118,679
Army Scrip. Readers' "	9,477
Protestant Reformat'n "	6,000	4,619
Naval and Mil. Bible "	3,252	1,782
Seamen's Chn Friend "	940
Protestant Alliance....	1,500	1,589
Unitarian Bible Society	882	747
Missions to Seamen....	7,310
British & For. Bib. Soc.	157,990	168,905

TOTAL IN 1864.

Foreign Missions	518,845
Colonial and Continental Miss.	40,038
Home Missions	149,369
Educational Societies	44,623
Jewish Societies	43,597
Miscellaneous	145,093
British & Foreign Bible Society	168,905

£1,210,000

It will be noted that this list embraces only the religious societies of England, not those of Scotland and Ireland.

THE PRESBYTERIANS OF SCOTLAND.—

According to a statement in the London Times, the United Presbyterian Church had, last year, 518 congregations, with 170,531 communicants, and an attendance on Sundays of 198,473. The total income of the Church was £216,618, being at the rate of £1 5s. 4jd. from each member. Nearly a fourth of the

whole income was devoted to missionary and benevolent objects. The Free Church may be considered as nearly twice as strong. It had last year 892 ministers with congregations, and 264,000 communicants. Its income was £341,934. It has three colleges, with fourteen professors and 196 students; while the United Presbyterian Church has 151 students. It has 610 teachers in its schools, which are attended by 48,039 pupils.

The joint committees appointed by the two Churches at their meetings last year, to consider and report on the means of forming a union, have ever since been diligently at work. At one of the last meetings of the commission of the Free Church, Dr. Buchanan, the convener of the committee of that body, presented an interim report, from which it appeared that the great question between the two parties was the power of the civil magistrate in matters of religion. They had proceeded so far in the examination of this question as to ascertain on what points they agreed and on what points they disagreed. They are agreed in holding that civil government is an ordinance of God; that the civil magistrate ought to further the interests of Christianity among his subjects in every way consistent with its spirit and precepts; that it is not his province to impose a creed on his subjects, or to interfere with the government of the Church; but that such questions as the ceremonies that are to constitute marriage, the observance of the Sabbath, and the appointment of days of national humiliation and thanksgiving, may properly fall under his regulation; always taking care, however, that neither Church nor State intrude into the proper province of the other. The following statements, drawn up by the committee of each denomination, present their diverging opinions on the relation of the Church to the secular government:

STATEMENTS OF FREE CHURCH COMMITTEE.

1. That while the civil magistrate must not so sustain himself a public judge of true or false religion as to dictate to his subjects in matters of faith, and has no authority in spiritual things, yet, owing obligation to Christ, he may lawfully acknowledge, as being in accordance with the word of God, the creed and jurisdiction of the Church. As a further act of homage to Christ, it is his duty, when necessary or expedient, to employ the

national resources in aid of the Church, provided always that in doing so, while reserving to himself full control over the temporalities, which are his own gift, he abstain from all authoritative interference in the internal government of the Church. And while the Church must ever maintain the essential and perpetual obligation which Christ has laid on all his people to support and extend his Church by free-will offerings, yet, in entire consistency with said obligation, the Church may lawfully accept aid from the civil magistrate when her spiritual independence is preserved entire. But it must always be a question, to be judged of according to times and circumstances, whether or not such aid ought to be given by the civil magistrate, as well as whether or not it ought to be accepted by the Church. And the question must, in every instance, be decided by each of the two parties judging for itself, on its own responsibility.

2. It follows from the preceding article, that any branch of the Christian Church consenting to be in alliance with the state, and to accept its aid, upon the condition of being subject to the authoritative control of the state or its courts in spiritual matters, or continuing in such connection with the state as involves such subjection, must be held to be so far unfaithful to the Lord Jesus Christ as King and Head of his Church. And upon this ground, in accordance with the history and the constitutional principles of the Church of Scotland, a protest is to be maintained against the present Establishment in Scotland.

STATEMENTS OF UNITED PRESBYTERIAN COMMITTEE.

1. That, inasmuch as the civil magistrate has no authority in spiritual things, and as the employment of force in such matters is opposed to the spirit and precepts of Christianity, it is not within his province to legislate as to what is true in religion, to prescribe a creed or form of worship to his subjects, or to endow the Church from national resources; that Jesus Christ, as sole King and Head of his Church, has enjoined upon his people to provide for maintaining and extending it by free-will offerings; that this being Christ's ordinance, it excludes state aid for these purposes; and that adherence to it is the true safeguard of the Church's independence.

2. That the United Presbyterian Church, without requiring from her members any approval of the steps of procedure by their fathers, or interfering with the rights of private judgment in reference to them, are united in regarding as still valid the reasons on which they have hitherto maintained their state of secession and separation from the judica-

stories of the Established Church, as expressed in the authorized documents of the respective bodies of which the United Presbyterian Church is formed, and in maintaining the lawfulness and obligation of separation from ecclesiastical bodies in which dangerous error is tolerated, or the discipline of the Church, or the rights of her ministry or members, are disregarded. Moreover, though uniformity of opinion with respect to civil establishments of religion is not a term of communion in the United Presbyterian Church, yet the views on this subject held and universally acted on are opposed to these institutions; and the statements set forth in these distinctive articles are regarded by that Church as a protest against the Church Establishment in Scotland.

FRANCE.

THE RATIONALISTIC CONTROVERSY.—The long struggle between the Evangelical and the Liberal (Rationalistic) parties in the two Protestant State Churches of France appears to approach rapidly a crisis, and all the indications are, that the ultimate result will be a gradual forcing of the Rationalistic party out of the Church. The first months of the year 1864 are signalized by events that may have a decisive influence on the future fate of the State Churches. In February the Presbyterial Council of the Reformed Church of Paris took a decided step against the leader of the most advanced wing of Rationalists in the Reformed Church, Mr. Athanase Coquerel, junior. Mr. Coquerel had been chosen, in 1850, by Mr. Martin Paschoud, one of the Rationalistic pastors of Paris, for his suffragan. This choice was hesitatingly ratified by the Consistory, which limited his exercise of the pastoral functions, first to three years and then to two, always subject to re-election. As the tendencies of Mr. Coquerel became from year to year more positively Rationalistic, and as he recently had even expressed his approbation of the work of Renan, this year the Presbyterial Council, by a vote of twelve against three, declined to re-elect him.

Another and even more serious defeat was sustained by the Rationalistic party at the annual pastoral conferences, both the "special" conferences (confined to ministers and elders of the Reformed and Lutheran Churches) and the "general," (in which representatives of all the Protestant Churches of France take

part.) Both the "special" and the "general" conferences lasted three days. At the former two propositions were discussed, one proposed by Professor Pedezeret, "that the conference declare that the Reformed Church of France has positive doctrines and official bodies bound to make them respected," and the other proposed by Pastors Vaurigaud, Lourde-Rocheblave, and F. de Conink, asking the conference "to renew the steps taken to obtain from the government the restoration of the synods, a restoration the importance of which circumstances render daily more indispensable." The former of these propositions was solemnly and warmly discussed for two days. At length a declaration presented by M. Guizot, the celebrated statesman, who is an elder in the Reformed Church of Paris, was carried by 141 votes against 28. This declaration, after mentioning the doctrines which have been chiefly attacked of late by members of the Reformed Church, goes on to say:

"We regard these negations as entirely destructive both of the Christian religion and of the Reformed Church. We have a firm belief in God's supernatural action in the government of the world; in the Divine and supernatural inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, as well as in their sovereign authority in matters of religion; in the eternal divinity and miraculous birth, as well as in the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, the God-man, the Saviour and Redeemer of men. We are convinced that these foundations of the Christian religion are also the foundations of the Reformed Church, which has positively recognized them as such throughout its liturgy, and which, together with the universal Church, makes a public profession of its belief in them through the Apostle's Creed.

"We also adhere as firmly as any, both for those who think differently from us as well as for ourselves, to the tutelary principle of religious liberty. In virtue of this principle every one is free to make open profession of his belief, and to connect himself with those who hold the same views; but we cannot understand what sort of a Church that would be which should have no common faith, and in which the most diverse or even the most opposite doctrines could be professed at pleasure. Such a state of things would not be the exercise of religious liberty, but the destruction of religious society, which, more than any other society, needs that an inner and real sympathy should exist between its

members. The Reformed Church of France is an old and organized religious society; it has vital principles and historical institutions; and even in the absence and expectation of its synods, it has in its consistories and presbyterial councils legal powers which, according to the regulations of the state as well as of its own discipline, have the right, and are also bound to maintain its principles. The Reformed Church recognizes no other rule of faith than the Scriptures, and it has never admitted, nor could it ever admit, that those who contest the divine and supernatural inspiration of the Scriptures, and their sovereign authority in religious matters, should, notwithstanding this, be authorized to speak and teach in its name. We have the firm conviction that, in giving this expression to our inmost and common convictions, we do but express the feelings of the great majority of the members of our Church, at the same time that we continue loyal to the faith of our fathers, and to the dignity as well as stability of the Church which they established."

In moving this declaration, M. Guizot delivered a speech of remarkable power, which made a profound impression upon the conference. He spoke strongly against permitting every pastor to interpret the Bible as he liked. This he said "would be the abolition of the Reformed Church itself. One of the essential facts and great results of the Reformation of the sixteenth century was, that it did not leave the religious world under the exclusive dominion of the ecclesiastical world. It gave to the laymen, to the faithful, a place and a part in the government of the Church by the side of the clergy. Authority resides in bodies whether pastors and laymen sit, deliberate, and decide together."

The proposition relative to the restoration of the synods of the Church was nearly unanimously adopted without discussion. A committee, consisting of General D'Hauteville, General de Chabaud-Latour, Professor Pédézet, and the Pastors Fermaud, Vaurigaud, Horace Monod, and Rognon, was appointed to see the Minister of Public Worship and plead with him the cause of the synods.

The general pastoral conferences were of a very stormy character. The question discussed was, "Are not the existence of every Church and the rights of the faithful compromised by unlimited liberty as regards religious teaching?" and the reply voted as follows: "Considering that for some years past there

have appeared, in books of all kinds, in the periodical press, in Protestant journals, and even in manuals of religious instruction, with the signatures of pastors and theological professors, opinions which attack not only the fundamental principle of the divine authority of the Holy Scriptures hitherto acknowledged by all the Churches of the Reformation, but the most elementary notions of Christianity; considering that the writers alluded to question the authenticity of the greater part of the Saviour's teaching, such as it is preserved to us in the Gospels, keep silence upon or deny his supernatural birth, miracles, and, above all, his resurrection, overturn not only the Christian idea of the creation of man in the image of God, and of his fall, but the very basis of natural religion, by shaking belief in the divine personality and in a future judgment; considering that the authors of these negations justify themselves by alleging that it is of the essence of a Protestant Church to admit unlimited freedom of teaching; this conference is of opinion, that as to what is involved in the conditions of the existence of every Church, the free expression in the pulpit, or by any other public and official means, of the doctrinal opinions of the pastors, has for necessary and legitimate limit the belief professed by the religious association from which those pastors derive their commission; and that as regards the rights of the faithful, the authority given to the pastors by their sacred ministry resides entirely in the conformity of their teaching with the declarations of the Holy Scriptures, and particularly in the fundamental doctrines of the divinity of Jesus Christ and redemption, which the universal Christian Church has always considered as evidently contained in the Bible, and which are expressed in all Protestant liturgies; and that consequently it is an abuse of power and spiritual tyranny to take advantage of the position as a minister of Jesus Christ and in a Christian Church, in order to propagate, directly or indirectly, doctrines contrary thereto. This declaration was voted by 160 against 6, several members of the minority having previously left the place of meeting. The minority had presented a counter declaration, so worded that both sides might join by giving their own different meanings to the expressions. The words "Jesus Christ, the Son of the living

God," occurring in it, an explanation was requested, when one of the signers of the proposition, Pastor Leblois, declared as it seemed, in concurrence with all the other signers, that Jesus was the son of God in the same sense that every Christian may become a son of God, according to Matthew, 45.

ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH. GERMANY.

THE CATHOLIC THEOLOGIANS IN CONFLICT WITH ROME.—The undeniable learning, ability, and liberality of a large number of the Catholic theologians of Germany have found, for a long time past, small favor with the dominant party in Rome, represented especially in the ordinary ecclesiastical tribunals which there sit and rule, or try to rule, the Catholic world. While the vivifying influences of a learned Protestantism has stimulated the German Catholics to fresh labors in their own defense, and called forth a Roman Catholic literature, upon which even the Protestant world looks with respect, the Italian priesthood have remained as ignorant as ever of the irresistible force which lies hid in the critical and scientific school of modern days. Those who are appointed by the Pope the censors of the theological literature of the world show themselves entirely unfit for such a position, and frequently condemn prominent Catholic writers on the ground of mistranslated passages of their work. Thus it was shown in the case of Dr. Hermes, one of the leading theologians of Catholic Germany, whose system was condemned at Rome some thirty years ago, that the translation made in Rome of the obnoxious doctrines was such as every German would pronounce entirely incorrect. But all the remonstrances of the friends and disciples of Hermes, among whom were several bishops and a large number of professors of theological faculties, were of no avail. Rome did not take back the condemnation, nor would she concede the possibility of the Pope acting upon an incorrect translation. Many other theologians and philosophers were censured in the course of time, who likewise complained that they were misunderstood in Rome, and that they were charged with doctrines which they had never professed. Some of them, nevertheless, submitted to the sentence of Rome, while others separated from the

Roman communion. Last autumn an important move was made by a large number of divines of unquestionable orthodoxy, and even of moderately ultramontane principles, which filled the Roman powers with the most serious apprehensions. Under the presidency of Dr. Dollinger, the first theologian of Germany and probably the first of the entire Catholic Church, a congress of Catholic scholars met and discussed the whole question of the relationship between theology and science in an unmistakably liberal and modern spirit. The Pope at once took the alarm, but was quieted by the address adopted at the congress and by the report of the Archbishop of Munich. Nevertheless before the year was out he addressed a brief to the archbishop, in which he claims for scholastic and received opinions, and for decisions of the Roman tribunals, the same absolute obedience which, in theory, is demanded only for the express dogmas of Trent. In fact he urges onward that open antagonism between scientific discovery and traditional or canonical opinions which was forced upon Galileo three hundred years ago.

This brief of the Pope is an event of more than ordinary importance in the modern history of the Roman Catholic Church, for it is likely to widen more than ever the breach between all that is progressive within the Church and the Papal authority. As far as Germany is concerned, the comments of the Catholic press on the congress clearly showed that nearly all the Catholic scholars and writers of the country were in sympathy with the congress. The spirit of the latter may be seen in the following resolutions, which, after a discussion lasting four days and conducted with unwonted eloquence and ability, was unanimously adopted:

"1. A close adhesion to revealed truth, as taught in the Catholic Church, is an important and indispensable condition of the progressive development of a true and comprehensive speculation generally, and in particular of victory over the errors that now prevail.

"2. It is a matter of conscience for all who stand on the basis of the Catholic faith to submit in all scientific investigations to the dogmatic utterances of the infallible authority of the Church. This submission to authority is not in contradiction to the freedom natural and necessary to science."

In reading these resolutions it must appear strange that the most intolerant censor should not be satisfied with the emphatic expressions of an unconditional submission to the authority of the Pope. Nevertheless, the reference to the freedom of science kindled the wrath of the Pope, who castigates in his brief the learned scholars without restraint. The following are some of the most salient points of this remarkable document:

"We could not help being extraordinarily astonished at seeing the convocation of the above-mentioned congress made and published in the name of some individuals, in such a manner that nothing is to be found which came from the impulsion, from the authority, and from the mission of the ecclesiastical power, to which alone it belongs, by proper and natural right, to watch over and direct doctrine, particularly in matters relating to theological questions. Certainly this is a thing, and you know it, quite new, and altogether unusual in the Church."

"We cannot conceal that we have suffered considerable uneasiness; for we fear lest the example of this congress, assembled without ecclesiastical authority, may serve by degrees to bring about an attack on the right of spiritual government and of legitimate teaching, which, in virtue of the divine institution, belongs of right to the Roman Pontiff and to the bishops who are in union and in accord with the successor of St. Peter; and that by reason of this trouble thus introduced into the government of the Church, the principle of unity and of obedience in matters of faith may one day be weakened among many. We feared also that in the same congress there might come to be uttered and sustained opinions and systems which, especially by the publicity which would be given to them, might place in peril the purity of Catholic doctrine and the duty of submission."

"Even when the submission due to the divine faith is the only question, it is

not to be restricted to those points which have been defined by express decrees of oecumenical councils or Roman Pontiffs and of this Apostolic See; it would be necessary further to extend it to all which is transmitted as divinely revealed by the ordinary body of instruction of the whole Church dispersed over the universe, and which, for this reason, Catholic theologians, with universal and constant consent, regard as belonging to faith. But as the question is of the submission which is due in conscience from all those Catholics who give themselves to the study of the speculative sciences in order to procure to the Church new advantages by their writings, the members of the congress ought to recognize that it is not sufficient for Catholic savans to accept and respect the dogmas of the Church of which we have just spoken, but that they ought also to submit themselves both to the doctrinal decisions which emanate from pontifical congregations, and to the points of doctrine which by common and constant consent are held in the Church as truths."

It is sufficiently evident from the terms of the letter that the Pope is not only seriously alarmed at the results arrived at by the congress, but that he and his advisers dread still more the permanent establishment of any such independent power within the Church. According to its present plan, the congress is to assemble annually for the discussions of questions connected with the welfare of the Church. The Pope accordingly condemns the very notion of such a conference as unauthorized, having been assembled without the express authority of the Holy See. He thinks it calculated to injure the integrity of the faith, as well as to weaken the implicit obedience which Catholics of every order owe to the authority of the Church.

ART. IX.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY.

THE large circulation which the work of Renan has found in France and elsewhere is probably the chief motive which has induced Dr. Strauss to prepare likewise a work on the same subject for the people, (*Leben Jesu für das Deutsche Volk*. Leipzig, 1864.) Strauss has over Renan the advantage of greater learning. He was one of the first who, by attacks upon the authenticity of the

Gospel record and the divinity of Christ, gave an impulse to the extensive critical literature of the last thirty years on the New Testament and on the primitive history of Christianity. Though removed from the theological chair of a Protestant university and from the pulpit of the Church, in both of which a man of his views had certainly no right to remain, Dr. Strauss has evidently continued to devote a great deal of time to reading the recent literature of the New Testament,

and to continuing in general his own investigations. The fruit of these studies he gives in the volume above referred to. The book bears on its face the signs of great learning and profound study, and on this account is likely to produce a more lasting impression than the work of Renan. On the other hand, the Frenchman is much superior to the German in point of style; and it is already evident that the work of Strauss will have nothing like the circulation of Renan's work.

The present position of Strauss with regard to the origin of Christianity does not materially differ from that which he held thirty years ago. The report which was circulated some months ago about his conversion was without any foundation. He still denies the historical character of most of the events in the life of Jesus and the primitive history of Christianity. Yet he is compelled to make important concessions to the many apologetic works which have been published since the appearance of his larger *Life of Jesus*, in 1835.

The stock of literature on the Waldenses has received an addition by a new critical edition of the old catechisms of the Waldensians and the Bohemian Brethren, (*Die Katechismen der Waldenser und Böhmisches Brüder*, Erlangen, 1863,) by Dr. von Zezschwitz, accompanied by learned essays on the relation of these two denominations to each other and to the Lutheran and Reformed Churches. The author thinks that the origin of the Waldensian catechism falls about into the year 1498, and that it was made use of in the compilation of that of the Bohemian Brethren. The latter, according to the opinion of Zezschwitz, was compiled between 1520 and 1522; and only the second part, distinguished from the first by long and intricate answers, proceeds from Lucas of Prague, who hitherto has been commonly regarded as the author of the whole catechism.

The recent attacks upon the fundamental doctrines of Christianity continue to call forth a number of popular apologetic works. "Six Lectures on the Person of Jesus Christ," (*Sechs Vorträge über die Person Jesu Christi*, Ingoldstadt, 1863,) delivered in Stuttgart by Herman Weiss, are recommended in the theological papers of Germany as very able.

A Protestant clergyman at Speyer, Bavaria, Th. Culman, has commenced the publication of a new manual of Christian Ethics, (*Die Christliche Ethik*, Stuttgart, 1864, vol. 1,) from a novel point of view. He is an ardent partisan of the peculiar mystic philosophy and theology ("theosophy") which recognizes its chief representatives in Jacob Böhme, Baader, Schelling, (his second system,) and Schaden. He defines ethics as the science of asceticism, or the science of the Christian rules of life, by the observance of which mankind are redeemed from sin and perfected into the image of God.

A new popular biography of Calvin has been published in honor of the tercentenary of his death, by Paul Pressel; (*Johann Calvin*, Elberfeld, 1864.) The author is already favorably known by other works on the history of the Reformation of the sixteenth century.

A fourth volume of Polenz's "History of French Calvinism," the best work on the Reformed Church of France, is also announced. It continues the history of French Calvinism to the death of Henry IV.

One of the most important works in Roman Catholic literature of Germany is the "History of the Apologetic and Polemical Literature of Christian Theology," by Dr. Werner, (*Geschichte der Apologetischen und Polemischen Literatur der Christlichen Theologie*, Schaffhausen.) The third volume has recently appeared.

Another Roman Catholic work on Church history is a monograph on "Hilarius of Poitiers, one of the prominent Bishops of the Church of the Fourth Century," by Professor Reinkens.

A new collection of Essays on some of the most difficult passages of the Old Testament has been published by F. Bötcher, (*Neue Exegetisch-Kritische Aehrenlese zum Alten Testamente*, Leipzig, 1864.) The work will be completed in three parts. A similar work, published by the same author in 1849, has secured for him the reputation of an able exegetical writer.

FRANCE.

The literature on the History of French Protestantism, of which we gave a survey in the last number of the *Methodist Quarterly Review*, has recently

received a very valuable addition by a work by Professor de Felice, of Montauban, on the "History of the National Synods of the Reformed Churches of France." (*Histoire des Synodes Nationaux des Eglises Reformées de France*. Paris, 1864.) The work contains forty chapters. The first contains a brief and lucid survey of the entire subject. The second is a comprehensive sketch of the condition of the Reformation in France until the first National Synod. It is followed by three chapters, on "The First National Synod, held at Paris in 1559;" "Some Remarks on the Confession of Faith of the Reformed Churches," and a "Brief Summary of their Discipline." The following twenty-seven chapters trace the History of the National Synods to 1659, the time when an interruption of sixty-six years commences, which forms the subject of the thirty-fourth chapter. In the next four chapters (thirty-four to thirty-seven) the eighth national synods held in the Desert from 1726 to 1763 are treated of. In the thirty-eighth chapter we find a new interruption of eighty-five years. The thirty-ninth chapter is devoted to the Protestant General Assembly, which met at Paris in 1848. The fortieth, and concluding chapter, contains a recapitulation of the whole, and the inferences which the author draws from the history of the synods. Each of the chapters devoted to the history of one of the synods consists of two parts, the history of the synod being preceded by a survey of the chief political events of the time in which the synod met.

The work of Professor de Felice has a special importance at a time when the ministers and laity of the Reformed Church are almost unanimously memorializing the French government for the restoration of the General Synod.

Pastor Puaux, the author of a History of the French Reformation, in six volumes, has published a popular "Life of Calvin," (*Vie de Calvin*. Paris, 1864,) in honor of the tercentenary of the death of the great Geneva Reformer. Of Merle d'Aubigné's "History of the Reformation in Europe at the time of Calvin," (*Histoire de la Reformation du Europe, au temps de Calvin*.) the third volume has been published. The Geneva Committee on Religious Publications has issued, in honor of the tercentenary, a new popular edition of

"Bungener's Life of Calvin." "The Life of Calvin," by Theodore Beza, has also been published in a new edition, and called forth a very unfair article in the *Journal des Debats*, from Sylvester de Sacy.

The agitation produced by the work of Renan still continues. Renan himself has issued a popular edition of his work for the masses of the people, which has likewise found a very extensive circulation. Another writer of the same school, Mr. Peyrat, has published an "Elementary and Critical History of Jesus," (*Histoire Elementaire et Critique de Jesus*.) Among the best new works written against Renan are that of Father Gratry, one of the most respected French writers on philosophy, and one of the first pulpit orators of France, and Abbé Freppel, already favorably known by several works on the primitive history of Christianity. Guizot is also reported to have prepared a work directed against Renan, under the title of "Religious Meditations."

E. de Pressensé, the learned editor of the *Revue Chretienne*, is one of the most prolific as well as the ablest writers of French Protestantism. His latest work on the "Church and the French Revolution" (*L'Eglise et la Revolution Française*) has been received with great applause by the literary press. His work is a History of the Relation of Church and State, from 1789 to 1802. It is divided into four books, whose contents are as follows: Book I. "The Constituent Assembly; Debates on Religious Liberty, on Church Property, on the Civil Constitution and the Oath Imposed upon the Clergy; Effects of these Measures in the Country." Book II. "The Religious Contest during the time of the Legislative Assembly and the Convention, in these assemblies and among the people." Book III. "The Regime of the Separation of Church and State; Restoration of the Altars." Book IV. "The Concordat, Its Religious Bearing and its Effects."

"The Idea of God and its new Critics" (*L'Idée de Dieu et ses nouveaux Critiques*) is the title of a new book published by Mr. Caro, already known by a number of other philosophical works. Mr. Caro belongs to what is called in France the new "Spiritualist School," which, in opposition to Pantheism and

Materialism, defends the personality of God and the spirituality and immortality of the soul. Descartes, Malebranche, Fenelon, Bossuet, Lacomiguière, Cousin, Jouffroy, Jules Simon, Saisset, are among the writers whom the author regards as the main pillars of the spiritualist school, and whose arguments he defends and supports.

The "Spiritualist School," of which Mr. Caro is one of the representatives, has, of course, nothing in common with what we generally understand by "Spiritualism." This latter school has, however, also found some followers in France, among whom is Mr. Caselli, who published last year a volume, entitled "Reality, or the Agreement of Spiritualism with Principles and Facts." (*Réalité; ou, Accord du Spiritualisme avec les Principes et les Faits.* Paris, 1863.)

Mr. F. Huet, a chief representative of the Gallican party in the Roman Catholic Church of France, has issued a work in two volumes, entitled "The Science of the Spirit," (*La Science de l'Esprit.*) In this work, which the author says is the fruit of twenty-five years of study, the author unites into one system all the parts of the Science of the Spirit, hitherto dismembered into several distinct sciences under the names of metaphysics and logic, psychology and ethics. Mr. Huet had previously written works on the "Social Influence of Christianity," an "Essay of Catholic Reforms," a "History of the Life and the Works of Bordes Demoulin," his fellow-laborer in behalf of reforms in the Catholic Church. He warmly defends the principal tenets of a Christian philosophy, in opposition to the attacks of modern anti-Christian schools.

ART. X. — SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES, AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Quarterly Reviews.

AMERICAN QUARTERLY CHURCH REVIEW, April, 1864. (New York.)—

1. Intercommunion of the Eastern and Anglican Churches. 2. The Two Theories of Civilization. 3. Positivism. 4. Some Thoughts about so-called Grecian Churches. 5. The Outwardness of our Popular Religion. 6. American Lutheranism and the Episcopacy. 7. Private Munificence in Parishes and Church Charities. 8. The Fulton-street Prayer-Meeting and the Daily Service. 9. Ante-Revolutionary Church and Clergy.

AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN AND THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, April, 1864. (New York.)—

1. The Messiah's Second Coming. 2. The Political Principles of the Old Testament Prophets. 3. The Antiquity of Man. 4. Bulgarian Literature. 5. The Principles of Morell's Philosophy. 6. Paul's Allegorical use of the Mosaic Narrative. 7. Theories of the Inspiration of the Scriptures.

DANVILLE REVIEW, March, 1864. (Danville, Ky.)—

1. The Nature and Extent of Church Authority. 2. The Nation's Success and Gratitude. 3. Baptist Revision of the Bible. 4. The Loyalty Demanded by the Present Crisis. 5. Disloyalty in the Church. 6. The Men of Danville. No. I. 7. New Testament Doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

EVANGELICAL QUARTERLY REVIEW, April, 1864. (Gettysburgh, Pa.)—

1. The Patriarchs of the Lutheran Church from Halle. 2. Instruction in Christian Doctrine according to the System of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. By John Henry Kurtz, D.D., Professor in the University of Dorpat. Translated from the Sixth German Edition. 3. Paul, the Missionary Apostle. 4. The Christ of History. 5. The Battle of Gettysburgh. 6. The Confessors and the Confession of Augsburg.

7. Revivals. 8. Inspiration. Translated from Zeller's "Biblisches Wörterbuch." 9. Lange's Theological and Homiletical Commentary on the New Testament.

FREEWILL BAPTIST QUARTERLY, April, 1864. (Dover, N. H.)—1. The Physician of the Body, and the Physician of the Mind. 2. Life and Times of Paul. 3. The Effects of the Fall upon Creation. 4. The Elements of Error in Human Life. 5. Geology and Revelation. 6. God among the Nations. 7. The Anglo-Saxon Church.

NEW ENGLANDER, April, 1864. (New Haven.)—1. The Conflict with Skepticism and Unbelief. Second Article: The Mythical Theory of Strauss. 2. The Atonement as a Revelation. 3. Poland. 4. The Atonement. 5. What makes a Heretic? 6. America Vindicated by an Englishman. A Review of Rev. Dr. J. W. Massie's New Book on the United States. 7. Review of the Autobiography of Rev. Dr. Lyman Beecher. 8. Review of Weiss's Life and Correspondence of Theodore Parker. 9. Charles Beecher's New Theory of the Work of the Redeemer.

BIBLICAL REPERTORY AND PRINCETON REVIEW. (Philadelphia.)—1. The Works of Plato. 2. Latin Christianity. 3. Man's Place in Nature. 4. Thoughts of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus. 5. The Superintendence of Foreign Missions. 6. Governor Winthrop. 7. St. Jerome.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, April, 1864. (Andover, Mass.)—1. The Genuineness of the Fourth Gospel. 2. Charles Wesley and Methodist Hymns. 3. The Author of the Apocalypse. 4. Final Cause of Varieties. 5. Examination of Phil. iii, 11, and Rev. xx, 4. 6. Rise and Progress of Monasticism. 7. Egyptology, Oriental Travel and Discovery.

The fourth is a brief but valuable article by Prof. Chadbourne, of Williams College, showing, especially with regard to vegetable species, that while abundant provisions are made clearly intended for the behoof of the species, there is a large surplusage as clearly intended for other benefit; especially for man, both as a physical and as an intellectual being. The potato, apple, and parsnip lay in provision more ample than their own needs, as if bound to provide for somebody besides themselves, and man is mostly the only pensioner that obtains their bounty. And the variations herein are produced for man by man, and are in the direction for his life and gratification. The rose varies, under man's cultivation, in the direction of beauty, sacrificing her own seeding—by a beautiful martyrdom—to develop and gratify his esthetic nature. Variation is, indeed, not so much *of* species as *in* species, there being probably limits which the specific vital force can never pass. But if there be no such limits then there is a limitless progress, both of the subservient and dominant species, of nature and of man, onward and upward beyond any assignable terminus. He is decisive against the Darwinian philosophy.

We consider the scientific discussion as to how animals and plants came upon this globe to be a matter of investigation as to facts. How that question will be ultimately decided we have no doubt. Biologists can throw light upon many dark points, but it is upon geology that we must mainly rely for facts. We have not yet seen any strong argument made out, nor do we believe that geology has yet given one whisper of satisfactory testimony in favor of the development theory. . . . We regard, then, the law of variation as a means of preserving the

species under certain circumstances, and as a means of better fitting created things for their various uses, and not as the creator of the thing, nor in any sense the originator of the species. Variation is the quality of a species, and not its producer.

BROWNSON'S QUARTERLY REVIEW, April, 1864. (New York.)—1. The Giobertian Philosophy. 2. Stevens on Reconstruction. 3. Abolition and Negro Equality. 4. The Next President. 5. Reade's Very Hard Cash. 6. Military Matters and Men.

Dr. Brownson in his first article introduces us to the philosophy of Gioberti, which he considers as superior to any existing system in expounding the validity of the objective world, and the coequal authority as well as harmony of reason and revelation. Gioberti affirms that *knowing* is true *knowing*, because the knowing intuition is not "the product of reason, but really constitutive of it, creating man and enabling him to *know* by giving him *à priori* the faculty and the object of science." If man, then, really *knows* the external world, there is no demand for proving its reality. All the result any reasoning can give is attained without reasoning. If man knows his own *self*, the syllogism of Des Cartes, *Cogito ergo sum*, is superserviceable. Gioberti identifies reason and revelation by showing that "the intelligible and superintelligible" are not separate and two, but a lower and an upper one. In the following argument against Des Cartes Dr. Brownson furnishes an exact parallel to Edwards's celebrated reasoning against the freedomist's self-determining power, namely, that a will cannot freely choose without choosing to choose, and choosing to choose to choose, in endless series. "If the simple knowing is not to be taken as certain till it is confirmed by something more ultimate, the fact of consciousness itself becomes uncertain, for consciousness itself becomes uncertain; for consciousness, or what the schoolmen call the *sensus intimus*, is only *knowing*. How do we know that we know that we have the internal affection? I think, therefore I am. But how do I know that I think? I think I think. But how do I know that I think I think? Thus we go on questioning forever, and can never get beyond the simple fact of knowing."

♦ ♦ ♦

English Reviews.

- THE BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, April, 1864. (London.)—1. Shakspeare. 2. Mr. Gladstone's Financial Statements. 3. Revealed Truth—Some of its Characteristics. 4. London Politics in the Thirteenth Century. 5. Trust Deeds and Religious Liberty. 6. Our National Sea Songs. 7. The Crawley Court-Martial. 8. The Privy Council Judgment. 9. On Degenerations in Man. 10. Foreign Affairs—Europe and America.
- THE CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER, April, 1864. (London.)—1. Africa and the Church. 2. Froude's Reign of Elizabeth. 3. Bishop Burnet and his Publications. 4. The Use and Abuse of Female Sentiment in Religion.

5. Memoir of Bishop Mackenzie. 6. New Zealand, as it Was and as it Is. 7. Intercommunion with the Eastern Church. 8. The Recent Judgment.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, (Wesleyan.) April, 1864.—1. Life in Deep Seas. 2. Robert Browning. 3. Bates's Naturalist on the Amazons. 4. The Ancestry of the Wesleys. 5. Captain Speke's Journal. 6. The Reign of Elizabeth. 7. Shakspeare. 8. Renan's Life of Jesus.

JOURNAL OF SACRED LITERATURE AND BIBLICAL RECORD, April, 1864. (London.)—1. The Sepulcher in Sychem. 2. The Typical Character of David: with a Digression concerning certain Words. 3. Selections from the Syriac. No. I.—The Chronicle of Edessa. 4. Cornelius the Centurion. 5. The Trumpet of the Soul sounding to Judgment. A Sermon by Henry Smith. 6. Exegesis of Difficult Texts. 7. On the Nature of Man. 8. The Epistle of Barnabas: from the Codex Sinaiticus. 9. The Decipherment of Cuneiform Inscriptions Described and Tested. 10. An Inquiry respecting the Origin of the Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus. 11. Water Supply of Jerusalem—Ancient and Modern.

The article on the Nature of Man has the following passage:

It may be worth while also to notice that what human nature is, is not in the least affected by any theory of the origin of species. The hypothesis, for example, of Mr. Darwin may or may not be compatible with the first chapters of Genesis, but it neither increases nor diminishes the nobleness of that human nature which belongs to existing men and women. The silly caricatures of Mr. Darwin's theory which have amused so many ignorant public meetings, and disgraced so many platform orators, bear no kind of resemblance to his theory itself. But if his wise and modest hypothesis were, in fact, the silly dogmatism which even the most ignorant bigot finds it quite easy to refute, it would make not the smallest difference to human nature. It is quite easy to distinguish even the varieties of existing animals, and much more easy to distinguish (at least the most prominent members of) what have hitherto been considered the different species of animals. No one mistakes a grayhound for a terrier, or a lion for an oyster; and if man had been slowly developed from a sponge or a weed, by a process of which even the very traces have been obliterated in the course of innumerable ages, he would still be man, and not either a weed or a sponge. In a word, what we are is not altered by the remotest of our antecedents any more than by the nearest; nor are the strength of body and robust intelligence of a full-grown man in the least dishonored by the utter helplessness of infancy. Whatever may be the physical difficulties of Mr. Darwin's theory, it has certainly not a single moral difficulty which is not to be found also in that region which lies between the germ and the maturity of each separate individual; and nothing can be more foolish or shortsighted than those angry discussions which at any rate seem to imply that the chief differences between a man and a beast are to be found not in his spirit, but in his body.—P. 77.

NATIONAL REVIEW, April, 1864. (London.)—1. The Apocalypse of St. John. 2. Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy's Letters. 3. The Provincial Assemblies of France. 4. Ireland. 5. Charles the Bold. 6. The Races of the Old World. 7. The Germanic Diet. 8. Sterne and Thackeray. 9. Early History of Messianic Ideas.

The first article in this able rationalistic Review decides that the Apocalypse is the work of the Apostle John, while the fourth Gospel is not. It holds that the Apocalypse is inspired with the elevated spirit of Christianity, but is a prophecy of the destruction of secular Rome by the advent of Christ then impending. The article on Races furn-

ishes a historical survey of races from the Abbeville flint chippers early in the drift period to the present day. The article on Messianic Ideas, assuming that the extant book of Enoch was published before the birth of Christ, maintains that it exhibits the then existing state of the Jewish mind on the subject of the Messiah, and so shows how the New Testament grows out of them. It is more foolish than Renan's book.

German Reviews.

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR HISTORISCHE THEOLOGIE. (Journal of Historic Theology.) 1864. Third number. 1. PH. SCHAFF, History, Genius, and Significance of the Heidelberg Catechism. 2. LAURENT, The Moravians of our Days. 3. KAPP, the Christianization of Moravia. 4. WATTENBACH, The Religious Condition of Silesia under Austrian Rule.

The centenary celebration of the introduction of the Heidelberg Catechism, the standard theological work of the Reformed Churches of Germany, Switzerland, Holland, and France, and their branches, the German and Dutch Reformed Churches in this country, has called forth quite a literature, especially in the German Reformed Church, which has celebrated that event with greater solemnity than any other branch of the Reformed Church. The above article of Professor Schaff is both interesting and exhaustive, as we are accustomed to find all the works of the learned professor, who, as a Church historian, has no superior among all the theologians now living. It treats—after some introductory statements on the various editions of and the works on the Catechism—of the time, occasion, and object of its preparation; gives biographical sketches of Frederic III., Elector of the Palatinate, the patron, and Ursinus and Olevianus, the authors of the Catechism; then passes over to the history of its compilation, its publication, reception, and spreading; and finally discusses its significance and theological character, giving also the opinions of prominent theologians respecting its value, and comparing it with the catechism of Luther. A concluding chapter refers to the arrangements which the German Reformed Church of this country had made for the centenary celebration of the introduction of the catechism, in 1863.

STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN. (Essays and Reviews.) 1864. Third Number.

1. WIESELER, Description of the Codex Sinaiticus. 2. VILMAR, The Symbolic Significance of the Nazarean Vow. 3. LAURENT, Critical Remarks on the Epistles of the Apostle Paul. 4. ZYRO, Remarks on Hebrews ii, 14. 5. RIEHM, Review of Weiss's Johanneischer Lehrbegriff, [The Doctrinal System of the Apostle John]. 6. BINDSEIL, Review of the new complete edition of Calvin's Works, edited by Baum, Canitz, and Reuss.

In the first article Professor Wieseler gives a minute description of the peculiarities of the celebrated Codex Sinaiticus, as compared with

other ancient manuscripts of the Bible. He also refers to the history of the codex, and to the pretensions of the well-known Greek forger of ancient manuscripts, Simonides, who, in a letter to the *London Guardian*, in 1862, made the audacious assertion that the Codex Sinaiticus was no old manuscript at all, but was compiled by him, Simonides, in 1839, from a modern Greek Bible, revised in comparison with some ancient manuscripts and the testimonies of the fathers. Wieseler regards the reply of Tischendorf in his pamphlet, *Die Anfechtungen der Sinai Bibel*, (Attacks upon the Sinai Bible, 1863,) as completely conclusive. With regard to the age of the codex, Wieseler agrees with Tischendorf that it cannot be fixed later than the fifth century, and that it even may belong to the fourth. Wieseler considers it probable that its origin is coeval with that of the Codex Vaticanus.

The author of the third article maintains that the chronological order of the Epistles of the Apostle Paul is as follows: 1. Second Thessalonians, from Berea, summer of 49. 2. First Thessalonians, from Corinth, 51. 3. Galatians, from Ephesus, 53. 4. First Corinthians, from Ephesus, 55. 5. Second Corinthians, from Macedonia, 55. 6. Romans, from Corinth, 56. 7. Philemon, from Cesarea, between 56 and 58. 8. Colossians, from Cesarea, between 56 and 58. 9. Ephesians, from Cesarea, between 56 and 58. 10. Philippians, from Rome, 59. 11. First Timothy, from Macedonia, 61. 12. Titus, during the voyage from Crete to Nicopolis, 61. 13. Second Timothy, from Rome, 63. The author gives at length his reasons for this arrangement, so far as the epistles to the Thessalonians are concerned.

JAHRBUCHER FÜR DEUTSCHE THEOLOGIE. (Yearbooks of German Theology.) 1864. First Number. 1. LAEMMERT, Contributions to a Revised Symbolism of Biblical Numbers. 2. WEISS, The Discourses contained in Matthew. 3. KLOPPER, The Meaning of the Parable, Mark iv. 26-29. 4. STEITZ, The Signification of the Medieval Formula, "*Obligare ad Peccatum*."

Second Number. 1. The Question of Miracles Examined in the Light of Modern Science. 2. WEINGARTEN, Richard Baxter and John Bunyan. 3. AUERLEN, Thomas Wizenman.

The fourth article in the first number treats of a medieval Latin phrase, the correct translation of which has long been a subject of animated dispute, and which has played a prominent part in the history of violent theological controversies. The constitution of the order of Jesuits contains this important passage: "Nullas constitutiones, declarationes, vel ordinem ullum vivendi posse *obligationem ad peccatum mortale vel veniale* inducere, nisi Superior ea in nomine Domini nostri Jesu Christi, vel in virtute obedientiae juberet." Whoever is unacquainted with the Church Latin of the Middle Ages, and reads the above passage cursorily, will be tempted to translate it, "that no constitutions, declara-

tions, or any statute of living, can involve an obligation to a mortal or venial sin, unless the Superior should command them (*the mortal or venial sin*) in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ or in virtue of obedience." Thus the distinguished historian Ranke, in his work on the Roman Popes, (*Die Römischen Päpste*, first edition, 1834, p. 220;) Reuchlin, in his classic work on Jansenism, (*Port Royal*, vol. 1, 1839, p. 38;) and Sylvester Jordan, in his work on the Jesuits, (*Die Jesuiten*, 1839, p. 63,) understood and translated the passage. But Ranke, in the second edition of his work, (1838,) abandoned this translation, and admitted that it was more reasonable to take, as the Roman Catholic writers have always done, this word "*obligatio ad peccatum*" in the meaning of "an obligation involving a sin," thus giving to the above the signification that none of the rules of the order so bind the members that the non-observance by itself involves a sin, but that a sin is committed only when a member violates a general order of the superior. Reuchlin likewise acknowledged his error in a new work on Pascal, (*Pascal's Leben*, 1840, p. 110.) One of the best German writers against the principles of the Jesuits, Ellendorf, (*Die Moral und Politik der Jesuiten*, 1840,) also gave the correct translation. Gieseler, in his great work on Church History, (vol. 3, ii, p. 535 *seq.*), adduced a number of examples from medieval monastic works, to show that the phrase "*obligare ad peccatum*" was everywhere used in the signification of an obligation (the non-observance of) which involves a sin. Since then, nearly all the German writers of note put the right construction upon the phrase, except Professor Jacobs of Halle, who, in his pamphlet on the Jesuits, (1862,) took up the interpretation which Ranke had first adopted but afterward abandoned. Dr. Weicker, in his work on the School-System of the Jesuits according to the Statutes of the Order, (*Das Schulwesen der Jesuiten*, 1863, pp. 282-288,) gives an essay of six pages on the meaning of the phrase, in which he adopts himself the correct translation, though he gives so many arguments for the contrary opinion as to leave the impression that he considered the true meaning to be doubtful.

Dr. Steitz, of Frankfort, thinks it therefore opportune to examine again the meaning of the words "*obligare ad peccatum*" in the Latin of the middle ages; and he treats of the whole subject in so lucid and exhaustive a manner as to remove the last doubt about the true meaning of the Jesuitical phrase. But while he exonerates the Jesuits from a crime with which they have been charged through insufficient acquaintance with medieval Latin, he at the same time clearly establishes the dangerous and demoralizing character of the blind obedience which the superiors of the Jesuits, as well as those of nearly all the monastic orders, demand from all the members of these orders.

French Reviews.

REVUE CHRETIENNE.—*February 15*.—1. PRESSENSE, The Religious Bearing of the Concordat. 2. ROLLER, Italy and the Italians. 3. PUAUX, The Death of Louis XIV. 4. ROSSEUW ST. HILAIRE, Conferences on the Life of Jesus.

March 15.—1. ROSSEUW ST. HILAIRE, The Duke of Alva in Flanders. 2. BERSIER, A New Commentary [by F. Godet] on the Gospel of St. John. 3. GUERLE, The Future of the Liberal Party.

April 15.—1. KUHN, the Unpublished Letters of Sismondi. 2. HOLLARD, The Monologues of Schleiermacher. 3. ROSSEUW ST. HILAIRE, The Church and the Revolution. 4. BERSIER, The Causes of the Deposition of Adolphe Monod.

The Protestant papers of France have had recently an interesting discussion on the deposition, in 1832, of Rev. Adolphe Monod, the great French pulpit orator, by the Consistory of Lyons. As the rationalistic party are charging the Presbyterial Council of Paris with intolerance for having dismissed the Rev. Athanase Coquerel, jr., (to which case we refer more fully in our department of Religious Intelligence,) they are reminded that in 1832 a rationalistic consistory dismissed one of the most gifted preachers of the Church for preaching against "unworthy communions," and for demanding that the Consistory should take measures for having all the persons wishing to take the communion examined, in order to exclude those whose lives did not correspond to their profession of faith. It appears that Mr. Martin-Paschaud, the same rationalistic pastor whose suffragan Mr. Athanase Coquerel, jr., was until his recent dismission, was at that time member of this Consistory of Lyons. The comments on this fact by the Protestant press of France have called forth a letter from Mr. Martin-Paschaud, in his organ, ("Le Disciple du Jesus Christ,") in which he gives a very detailed account of the occurrence. It appears from this account that the two reasons above stated were the only ones adduced by the consistory for the act of deposition, and not the subsequent refusal of Monod to distribute the Lord's supper, though this latter act is mentioned in the decision by which the government (the celebrated Cuvier at that time was charged with the administration of the Protestant worship) confirmed the deposition.

REVUE DES DEUX MONDES.—*February 1, 1864*.—1. QUATREFAGES, Natural History of Man: The Polynesians and their Migrations. 2. D'ASSIER, The "Mato Virgem," Scenes and Reminiscences of a Journey in Brazil. 4. MAZADE, "Le Maudit," a Novel on the Religious Habits of France. 5. FORGUES, Contemporaneous English Novels. 6. REVILLE, The Ancestors of the Europeans in Ante-historic Times: the Arian People according to Modern Science. 7. E. DU HAILLY, The French Antilles and Liberty of Commerce.

February 15.—3. QUATREFAGES, Natural History of Man, (second article.) The Origin and Migration of the Polynesians. 4. E. RECLUS, The Poetry and the Poets of South America since its Independence. 5. LANGEI,

- Philosophical Studies in England: Herbert Spencer. 9. L. DE LAVERGNE, The Elections of 1789.
- March 1.*—1. ESQUITROS, England and English Life, (twenty-third article.) 6. MONTEGUT, Historical and Moral Character of Don Quixote. 9. WOŁOWSKI, The Finances of Russia.
- March 15.*—2. F. LENORMANT, Greece since the Revolution of 1862. 3. PAYEN, Chemical Industry in the Nineteenth Century.
- April 1.*—1. PAVIE, Devadatta, Scenes of Hindoo Life. 5. E. DE LAVELEYE, Rural Economy in the Netherlands. 6. AMPERE, End of Liberty at Rome. 7. MAZADE, Liberal Ideas and Modern Literature.
- April 15.*—1. SAINTE BEUX, Sketches of Cotemporaneous Poets. 3. L. DE LAVERGNE, The Bank of France and the Banks of the Departments. 5. SAVENCY, The Forces of Italy.

ART. XI. —QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

A History of Christian Doctrine. By WILLIAM T. SHEDD, D.D. 2 vols., 8vo., pp. 408, 508. New York: Charles Scribner. 1863.

Dr. Shedd's history has already, we understand, attained a second edition. With his clear, terse, grave style, the expression of stern and positive opinions, aided by Scribner's liberal margins, bold type, and broad spaces, the work affords pleasanter and easier reading than hard theology usually presents. Nor is it by vailing the stern features of his system that Dr. Shedd wins our attention. It is the rich ebony luster that constitutes a main attraction.

His history is professedly history written from a special stand-point, and with an honorable frankness he avows this specialty. "I have felt," he says, "a profound interest in the Nicene trinitarianism, the Augustinian anthropology, and the Anselmic soteriology, and from these centers have taken my departure." As the Augustinian anthropology is pregnant with a doctrine of necessitated will, transferable guilt, and predestination, it is readily seen that Dr. Shedd occupies the stand-point of high Calvinism. The purpose of the work is to present such a view of doctrinal history as shall be soft and easy to a Calvinistic eye. It is a difficult task. That system is no doctrine of the general Church. Taking its origin with Augustine, unknown to the primitive Church, rejected by all the oriental Churches, traceable only as a narrow streak adown the ages of the Western Church, it is condemned by the almost unanimous voice of Christian history. Hence the object of the present work required the sacrifice of all symmetry, the prominent expansion of the narrow and the exceptional, and the flinging the main field into the background. This task Dr. Shedd has performed with masterly skill. His object is of course attained very much by the sacrifice of the claims of the work as history. His pro-

duction can scarce be quoted without distrust as historical authority. It is *polemics*; and viewed as such it is replete with interest, and may occupy an important place in our doctrinal literature. It needs to be *answered* by counter history; and the debate may then be held and the truth be vindicated as effectually upon historical as upon exegetical and logical grounds.

Dr. Shedd constructs his history not so much by Periods as by topics. Each single doctrine is selected, and its history is singly traced from the Christian era to the present day. His topics are, Christian Apologetics; the Trinity, including Christology; Anthropology, including the doctrines of Will and Depravity; Soteriology, including Atonement and Predestination; and Eschatology. It is thus not so much a history as a series of historical dissertations.

Of Augustine, Dr. Shedd's theological idol, we admire rather the great talents and massy volume than the theological soundness. There is scarce a character in Church history from whom we inherit so disastrous a theological legacy. His conversion from Manicheanism seems ultimately to have consisted in slicing away the better half of his double God, and spreading the black deity over the firmament of Christian theology. To his *ingenium atrox* we trace the accursed dogmas of infant damnation, transferred guilt, the identification of depravity with sexual appetite, and predestination. Pelagius was the better man, and not doctrinally the greater heretic. The former relaxed the moral nerve of man; the latter *diabolized* God. The former was a practical rationalist; the severer doctrines of the latter, while they repelled and made infidel the highest reason of man, when fully accepted, resulted often in a self-immolating but reasonless piety, none the less selfish for its self-immolation, resembling the self-consecration of an oriental pantheist. True Christian doctrine lies between the two; is neither Pelagian nor Augustinian; rejects the self-sufficiency and disregard of gracious divine aids of the former, and the God-dishonoring fatalism of the latter. It is this golden mean of true theology which the whole Christian Church of the first three centuries held; which, with minor variations, the great body of the Christian Church, Eastern, Roman, and Protestant, holds; the Protestant, with the exception of those sections which have come under the influence of the Genevan forger of the *decretum horribile*. Dr. Shedd's great art consists in bringing out into monstrous prominence the narrow and exceptional, so that Church doctrinal history consists largely of a history of doctrines which the Church did not hold.

When he comes to the anthropology of the entire Christian Church eastern and western, from the time of the apostles to the time of Augustine, Dr. Shedd is obliged to exert his utmost ingenuity to evade

the undeniable but stupendous fact that all the peculiarities of modern Calvinism are utterly contradicted and condemned, and that the entire Christian body was what would now be considered substantially Arminian. The Eastern Church, Syriac and Greek, he is compelled to surrender outright. Its theology was not far from the sub-Arminianism of Limborch and Curellæus. Under a prattle about "germs" and "tendencies" to Augustinism in the early Western Church, etc., he endeavors to disguise the fact that its pre-Augustinian theology was not above the level of the Arminianism of Arminius himself. Of this he tells us Augustinism was a development; which is as true as that Princeton theology is a development of Wesleyan theology. Dr. Shedd's phrase, "the Latin or Augustinian theology," is a plump historical mistake. Augustinian theology never was "the Latin theology." It was, even in the West, generally the theology of a slim minority of fatalistic ultraists. But what we wish specially to emphasize and spread out for deliberate contemplation and permanent memory is this: Even in the West before the teaching of Augustine the entire Church rejected the doctrine of hereditary guilt, necessitated damnability, irresistible grace, predestination, unfree will, and unconditional election. This whole brood of cockatrice's eggs was hatched in the Church by the evil genius of the fervid African. The primitive Western theology was not the theology of Calvin, nor Twisse, nor Hodge, nor Shedd; but rather of Arminius, of Cranmer, of Wesley, of Watson, of Wilbur Fisk, and of this our Methodist Quarterly Review.

Dr. Shedd's explication of Augustine's doctrine, which is of course his own, abounds with self-contradictions and absurdities, of which we will specify a few.

He confounds again and again the *voluntary* with the volitional. "Voluntariness consists in willing." Vol. ii, p. 58. Now a voluntary act is an act (generally corporeal) in accordance with and *consequent upon* a volition; not the *volition itself*. Hence "voluntariness" does not "consist in willing," but in obeying the will.

Again, Dr. Shedd denies that freedom consists in a "power of contrary choice." That is, a free choice is a choice other than which no choice could be put forth; that is a choice which the agent could not help putting forth. Now how is such a choice any more free than any other event which cannot be helped, or the different of which cannot be, as a clock stroke or waterfall? A *splendid* liberty is that; the liberty of doing what you cannot help doing!

Again, he places much emphasis upon the difference between a depravity of the will and a depravity of the sensibilities. And yet he tells us, (p. 61.) "Voluntariness has not perished in the sinner, because he sins *with delight, and delight is voluntariness*." If delight

is voluntariness, (volitivity,) then a delight is a volition and the will and sensitivity are one, for delight is a sensitivity. In what consists then the difference between a depraved will and a depraved sensitivity? And how is will any more free than a desire or perception?

Again, he tells us that freedom consists in *uncompelled* self-motion. But how is an act which cannot be avoided otherwise than *compelled*; or at any rate the more free for not being *compelled*? *Compulsion* to an act can do no more than render it an act which *cannot be helped* or *cannot be otherwise*. Or how is a self-motion which cannot be helped any more free than any other kind of motion? Self-motion or not self-motion, it is still motion that cannot be helped. A caused motion can be nothing more than *a motion the agent cannot help*, and that much the self-motion is. A self-motion that cannot be helped is, if not a compelled self-motion, certainly a necessitated self-motion; and a self-motion necessitatively tacked to me is no more free than a motion caused by a cause other than the self. A necessitated self-moved volition is no more free than a gravitating water-drop.

Again, he elaborately maintains that sinning is a free act because the will creates sin, *de nihilo*, from nothing. But what difference does the material or non-material, wrought upon by the will, make in regard to the freedom of the volition? A volition which cannot be helped, to create out of nothing, is no more free than such a volition to create out of something.

Again, he tells us, (p. 61,) that in the Greek anthropology freedom is "indetermination or indifference." Now no anthropology, Greek, Latin, Dutch, or English, ever held freedom to be "indetermination" itself. It consists, according to the Greek anthropology, in a *power* to will either of several ways; hence, though it may exist in the mind's state of indetermination, and be exerted in the act of passing from that indetermination, yet it is very absurd to say that the freedom is the indetermination itself.

More we might say; but is more needed to show Dr. Shedd's utter failure to master these questions? This results from no deficiency of intellectual power, but from the necessity of his position. Augustinism is inevitably theological self-stultification. None of that narrow school ever dealt with these topics without groping like the blind-struck men of Sodom at the door of Lot.

In regard to Dr. Shedd's direct treatment of Arminianism we can realize that "blessed are those who expect nothing, for they shall not be disappointed." The random statements contained in his "Discourses" warned us of his unacquaintance with a theology which he imagined himself to be opposing, when, in fact, he was only misunderstanding and misstating. Dr. Shedd's reading, like his writing, has

been one-sided. His studies, like every other man's, have been not universal, but partial, and they have not lain among the great Arminian divines; and his second-hand quotations and misstatements are of the most perturbing nature. He tells us (vol. ii, p. 496) that the writings of Limborch were dogmatical and those of Curcellæus were exegetical; whereas a glance at their pages would have made him say that Limborch is partly exegetical, and Curcellæus wholly dogmatical. A reading of those great Arminians might have prevented his giving Limborch as the Latin form of Limborch, instead of Limburgius. The name of Curcellæus is spread in capitals on the album page as among his standard Arminian authorities on soteriology, and his book vii is specified as the treatment of that subject; whereas Curcellæus, we are sorry to say, essentially Socinian on the atonement, and his book vii has nothing to do with the subject. That book is entirely devoted to Christian ethics. What is more amusing still, Dr. Shedd (vol. ii, p. 373) professedly quotes, refutes, and flaunts with a lofty sneer at the soteriology of (as he supposes) Curcellæus, when in fact it is Limborch whom he is really quoting, giving the twenty-second chapter of Curcellæus's Third Book as his authority, when there are not twenty-three chapters in his Third Book; and his Third Book has nothing to do with soteriology. Curcellæus discusses very briefly the atonement in his Fifth Book; and a perusal of that book will show Dr. Shedd that he is no representative of Arminian soteriology, his views being even below the Grotian.

The correctness of his treatment of this point in this passage is about equal to the accuracy of the quoting. Dr. Shedd's words are, (quoting imaginarily Curcellæus, really Limborch, *Theologia Christiana*, lib. iii, chap. xxii):

"Jesus Christ," says Curcellæus, "may be said to have been punished (*punitus*) in our place, in so far as he endured the greatest anguish of soul, and the accursed death of the cross for us, which were of the nature of a vicarious punishment in the place of our sins,* (*quæ poenæ vicariæ pro peccatis nostris rationem habuit*). And it may be said that our Lord satisfied the Father for us by his death, and earned righteousness for us, in so far as he satisfied, not the rigor and exactitude of the divine justice, but the just as well as compassionate will of God, (*voluntati Dei justæ simul ac misericordiæ*) and went through all that God required in order to our reconciliation." According to these positions, the sufferings of Christ were not a substituted penalty, but a substitute for a penalty. A substituted penalty is a strict equivalent, but a substitute for a penalty may be of inferior worth, as when a partial satisfaction is accepted for a plenary one, by the method of acceptation; or, as if the finite sacrifice of the lamb and the goat should be constituted by the will of God an offset for human transgression. And the term "satisfaction" also is wrested from its proper signification, in that the sufferings of Christ are asserted to be a satisfaction of *benevolence*. "Our Lord satisfied . . . not the rigor and exactitude of divine justice, but the just and *compassionate* will of God," a use of language as solecistical as that which should speak of smelling a sound.—Pp. 372-374.

* What does Dr. Shedd mean by "a vicarious punishment in the place of our sins?"

Now Limborch, whom Dr. Shedd is unknowingly quoting here, really takes the ground that Christ did not suffer infliction either *identical* or *equivalent* to the sinner's true desert, but a *less* accepted by God in the stead of the greater. "So that in this sense," he adds, "Jesus Christ *may be rightly said to be punished* in our stead, inasmuch as he bore for us the accursed death of the cross, which had the nature (*rationem*) of a vicarious punishment for our sins. And in this sense the Lord by his own death can be said to have satisfied the Father for us, and for us to have merited justification inasmuch as he satisfied not the rigor of divine justice, but *the will of God*, just and at the same time merciful, and performed all required by God to our reconciliation." Now Dr. Shedd's assertion that the term "satisfaction" is here "solecistically" applied, and that "the sufferings of Christ are asserted to be a satisfaction of benevolence," are palpably incorrect. It is God's "*just will*" which receives the "*satisfaction*." That *will* is indeed additionally *merciful*; but that mercy is engaged not in demanding satisfaction, but in diminishing the amount of suffering demanded. The mercy cancels just its own amount of the requirement of satisfaction. It is really because the *benevolence* does not require satisfaction that, in Limborch's view, Christ's penal sufferings may be less. If "smelling a sound" be as little "solecistical" to Dr. Shedd's senses as satisfying a just demand lessened by mercy, then his olfactories must be endowed with a vigorous taste for music.

We close our criticisms on this work not because we lack matter, but room. Dr. Shedd's apology for his work on the grounds of want of time for correction we should cheerfully accept, but that we fear that from his theological position greater care would produce little improvement.

A Commentary on the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, Critical, Doctrinal, and Homiletical; embodying for popular use and edification the results of German and English Exegetical Literature, and designed to meet the difficulties of Modern Skepticism. With a General Introduction, treating of the Genuineness, Authenticity, Historic Verity, and Inspiration of the Gospel Records, and of the Harmony and Chronology of the Gospel History. By WILLIAM NAST, D.D. 8vo., pp. 760. Cincinnati: Poe & Hitchcock. 1864.

Dr. Nast was requested by the General Conference to furnish a commentary for our American German Methodists, and after some years of hesitation completed the work to the close of Mark. The publication received such commendation in Germany and America as seemed to him an imperative call to furnish an English translation. We have the result, thus far, in a single magnificent volume, doing credit alike to the learning, talent, and industry of the author, and the splendid workmanship of our western publishers. Such a work from

such a quarter is a suggestive fact, that might justify, had we room, some pleasant expatiation.

Dr. Nast has peculiar qualifications for the work. He is pre-eminently *bilingual*; at home on both sides the great Teutonic world; for England and English America, as well as Germany, are Teuton. From beginning to end of his work, we believe not one false idiom will suggest that he is not handling his mother-tongue. He quotes liberally, with honorable credits, from both languages. Olshausen, Stier, Lange, and Ebrard are his favorite Germans. These are indeed now all extant in the English language, but they were not when he commenced his work; and the judiciousness of his selections from them renders his work in some degree a substitute for them.

The work opens with an elaborate Introduction, which is at the same time a treatise of a particular part of Christian evidences. Commencing with the text of the New Testament, it demonstrates, first, that we have a genuine and reliable copy of the original books; second, that the books were written, as claimed, by original eye-witnesses or cotemporaneous historians; and third, that being so genuine and cotemporaneous, they are reliable and *true*. This is followed by an elaborate Synoptical Table and index.

Dr. Nast allows himself full elbow-room and ample scope. The sacred text is by him divided, not by chapters, but into paragraphs; to each paragraph is prefixed an elaborate introduction; the text then appears, in a large and beautiful type; philological and geographical notes are relegated to the foot of the page; a full commentary then follows the text; and a series of homiletical suggestions closes the procession. And so our commentator commences his grand march through the New Testament. It purposes to be a *thesaurus* for the lay reader, for the family, for the minister. Though by no means a compiler, but an independent thinker, Dr. Nast quotes extensive passages from his predecessors in exegetical literature. Trench, Wilson, Alexander, Ellicott, are his favorite English authors. His Homiletical Suggestions are mostly from "The Homilist," a valuable English periodical.

We have a special criticism or two. The "interpretation" quoted upon page 199, of Matthew ii, 23, is hardly "the generally-received" one; it was first introduced into commentary by the commentator quoted, and for it he was indebted to Hengstenberg's theory of prophetic vision. We are also pleased to note that Dr. Nast adopts our view of the Nazarene in Matthew ii, 23, for which also we were much indebted to Hengstenberg. It is not wholly new, but it had been dropped out of commentary; and with due thanks to Hengstenberg, we added new argument in its behalf. Lastly, it is surprising to us

that in his commentary on Matthew xxiv he should apply the epithet "fanciful" to our interpretation. An interpretation which discards all fancy; which simply asks that words may have their ordinary meaning, and that such meaning shall not be arbitrarily changed, but remain permanent in the same discourse; that figures shall be discarded for literality, and double meaning for single meaning; which only asks a blending of different reports into one, and a proper paragraphing and type, may be a faulty interpretation, but it is a queer fancy that styles it "fanciful." Dr. Nast's commentary seems to us, like that of the other modern allegorists, mist and double entendre; depriving the discourse of all value as prophecy against skepticism, furnishing the basis of modern Universalism, and destroying the scripture proof of a future literal judgment day. This we showed at length in an article, some years since, in the Methodist Quarterly Review. This Dr. Nast, perhaps, would realize should he enter into debate with a skillful Universalist, by whom we think any reasoner would be logically floored after the admissions of his interpretation. As to our interpretation involving the premillennial advent, Dr. Nast's weighty but blank *assertion* stands at issue, we think, with our repeated *argumentation*. If that passage, as by us interpreted, implies a premillennial advent, then, as could be easily shown, numerous other passages imply the *then* immediate advent.

But a truce with these specialties. Dr. Nast is prosecuting a noble work for the general Church. To it he tells us he has consecrated his life. With his arduous labors as Coryphæus of our "German work," as editor of our German periodical, as author of our German Commentary, it must take some years for even him, German and giant though he be, to complete the enterprise. We rejoice in the recollection that the age of "giants" was also the age of Methuselahs.

Man All Immortal; or, the Nature and Destination of Man as taught by Reason and Revelation. By D. W. CLARK, D.D. 12mo., pp. 464. Cincinnati: Poe & Hitchcock. 1864.

Dr. Clark has here presented a volume replete with gems of thought upon a topic of all topics of the highest interest to our humanity. The volume is the full completion of a work first projected as a course of lectures to his students when principal of Amenia Seminary. Years of reading and thought have furnished additional items, and it has now received from the handicraft of Poe & Hitchcock its present handsome embodiment.

Man as soul and body—soul to live forever and body to die for future

resurrection—is his theme. First he investigates in the light of physiology and philosophy the soul as related to higher and lower life, and to the corporeal organism. He shows that mind is not a function of body, but that on the contrary body is the mere organ of mind. He traces the relations of the soul to the senses as the means by which it is used at its will as avenues for knowing the outer world; whence soul is easily seen to be an independent agent, essentially separable from its external machinery, without any alteration in itself. The distinction is then drawn between instinct and reason. The former is not only "prior to experience and independent of instruction," but without forethought and under guidance of the divine intelligence.

From the nature of soul he proceeds to consider its destiny—Immortality. He argues this first from the indestructibility of all created objects, but does not show how this does not prove the immortality of brute mind. Other arguments adduced as from Universal Consent, and from man's higher faculties, are not liable to the same remark. He next considers Death, the breaking away of the machinery from around the agent, the physiology of the process, the wisely appointed terrors by which death is made repugnant and life is guarded, and the higher phenomena by which the triumphant soul demonstrates her self-hood amid the dissolution of the organism. Next the doctrine of the Intermediate State is duly traced. Soul is maintained, as well as body, to possess the human form, and in the disembodied state it waits the day of Universal Judgment. Inter-course, he believes, may exist between the visible and invisible worlds; though he thinks there is no authentic instance of the appearance of the departed to the living, in which we differ from him. The scriptural and philosophical argument for the Resurrection then follows at full length and with great clearness. The recognition of friends in heaven is maintained. The Memory, (which is shown by striking facts to be indestructible,) combined with Conscience, is the book of retribution and also its executor. The glories of the final Heaven, located doubtless in the central Orb of the Universe, are then unfolded with an eloquence in which Scripture and philosophy blend their wonderful affirmations.

We welcome this noble work as a rich contribution to our religious literature. It is full of points for pulpit amplification, and rich with lessons of priceless interest for the Christian reader. While reading and erudition are laid under ample contribution to supply material, the whole is rendered comprehensible to the plainest understanding, and attractive to the most indolent thinker. It is rich in anecdotal illustration. Truth is thus reduced to concrete form, and the pages

of the volume are invested with a popular interest well calculated to carry the volume into the families of the Church.

The Religion of Childhood; or, Children in their Relation to Depravity, to the Family, and to the Church. By Rev. F. G. HIBBARD, D.D. 12mo., pp. 411. Cincinnati: Poe & Hitchcock. 1864.

The writings of the venerated Olin it was which first awakened our thinkers to a discussion of the relations of the child to Christ and the Church. The slight overstatements of some later writers have awakened a spirit of caution, wise in itself, but not intended to silence thought and discussion upon the subject. Whether right in his precise views or not, Dr. Hibbard's spirit is gentle and loyal, his investigation searching, his style clear, and his objects pure. Much is due to him for advances in our discipline and practice in relation to the children of the Church.

Dr. Hibbard, as we understand him, maintains the doctrine of man's natural depravity as thoroughly as any thinker in our Church. He requires just as strictly the evidences of a regenerate state, as condition to admission to the Church's full communion. He thus avoids Pelagian theology and unregenerate Church-membership. Such he holds are the relations of the yet irresponsible child to the atonement, that he is, by the overlying power of the blessed Spirit, in that state which is to him as an infant parallel to what regeneration is to an adult. Whether you apply the term *regenerate* to it or not he thinks of little consequence.

The main omission of Dr. Hibbard's book is of a chapter showing what is "Methodist Theology" on the subject. We would thank some well-read thinker to furnish for our Quarterly a collation of all the passages to be found in our standard authors, from Wesley to Olin, on the gracious status of infants. It is not enough to tell us what are the present prevalent opinions of the majority of Methodists, for denominational opinions often drift away from their own standards and symbols. It is not enough for an editor glibly to tell us that such and such is "Methodist Theology," for we editors, poor fellows, sometimes fail of infallibility. We wish to go back of both current opinion and editorial authority, and learn what the Church is responsible for as "Methodist Theology."

We thank our brethren of the Western Concern for giving this work, "for the author," to the public. We believe every earnest and honest thinker in the Church will desire that the present speaker be candidly heard, and if there be anything contrary to sound doctrine and true godliness in his work, the error be eliminated, and the truth be maintained or adopted.

Lectures and Addresses. By Rev. JOHN DEMPSTER, D.D. With an Appendix, containing the Funeral Sermon and Memorial Services occasioned by the Death of the Author. Edited by Rev. DAVIS W. CLARK, D.D. 12mo., pp. 453. Cincinnati: Poe & Hitchcock. 1864.

This memorial volume will be a welcome gift to the thousands of friends and admirers whom the long and noble career of the author won to love and reverence his person and character. It contains twenty-one public addresses, the flower of his rich and luxuriant nature. So much has been said, and so well, by the contributor of the first article of our present number that we need add no syllable of our own to commend the works of Dr. Dempster to our readers. We trust that much more is yet to come to hand through the press from his manuscripts extant. Especially we think the entire thoughtful body of the Church will desire that his unfinished work on the Will should be given to the public.

The memorial appendix contains the Funeral Sermon, by Dr. Eddy; Dr. Dempster as a Minister, by Rev. F. D. Hemenway, A. M.; as a Missionary, by Dr. Kidder; as a Student and Thinker, by Dr. Bannister; as an Instructor, by Rev. C. H. Fowler, A. M., one of the Alumni of the Garrett Institute; and as a Man of Progress, by Dr. Tiffany. These honors to the sainted dead were paid worthily and well. From Mr. Hemenway we give the following anecdote:

When first stationed in Rochester, N. Y., he received an early call from a prominent Episcopalian clergyman, then resident in that city. In the course of the conversation he remarked, "Mr. Dempster, I am glad to welcome you to our city. Some of your preachers here have been somewhat tinged with fanaticism, but from what I have heard of you, I am sure you will countenance no such proceedings." Said Dr. Dempster, "You have entirely mistaken my character, sir. If I understand your use of the term, I am one of the most fanatical men on the footstool, and I intend to do all in my power to promote such fanaticism in this city." And he was successful; for there commenced under his ministry there such a gracious visitation as was never known besides in the history of that city, the blessed fruits of which are scattered far and wide.

The Two Sabbaths: an Essay showing that the Patriarchal and Christian Sabbath(s) are one and the same, and that the Jewish Sabbath has been abrogated. By Rev. E. Q. FULLER. 24mo., pp. 101. Cincinnati: Poe & Hitchcock. 1864.

This neat little volume contains many valuable thoughts in regard to the doctrine of the Sabbath expressed in clear and easy style. Upon the special point, however, that the patriarchal Sabbath was upon the first day of the week, we see no Scripture proof whatever. That question is left by our author just where it was; absolutely no question at all for want of data for argument.

Coleso's Fallacies: another Review of the Bishop of Natal. By Rev. C. H. FOWLER, A.M. With an Introductory Essay and Review of Part II. By Rev. HENRY BANNISTER, D.D., Professor of Hebrew and Greek Exe-

gesis in the Garrett Biblical Institute. 24mo., pp. 139. Cincinnati: Poe & Hitchcock. 1864.

Natal, London, and Evanston imply magnificent distances over which this contest ranges and rages. It is a world-wide question that is under debate. We commend the "Review" of the young champion in Illinois to the attention of our readers. Whether his replies be or be not conclusive, they are at any rate brief.

◆◆◆

Foreign Theological Publications.

Das Charakterbild Jesu. Ein Biblischer Versuch. Von DR. DANIEL SCHENKEL. Second Edition. 8vo., pp. 405. Wiesbaden: 1864.

Amid the flood of books and pamphlets now inundating Germany, touching the life of Christ and his modern biographers, the above deserves, on many accounts, to be singled out for more particular notice. In the first place, Dr. Schenkel is one of the strongest and most influential leaders of the lay representation party now aiming at the consolidation of all the Protestant State Churches into one self-governing democratic organization, and the recasting of the evangelical creed into a form more "consonant with the thought and culture of the age." Perhaps the book will give us some idea of the character of the new phase of Christian belief which he and his party would fain inaugurate. In the second place it has had a flattering reception, a second edition having been called for in a very short time, despite the competing works of *Osterzee*, *Strauss*, (his new *popular* treatise,) *Renan*, etc. Indeed, the author had no time to alter or emend a single paragraph, or hear the verdict of the critics; he could only give us a new unaltered reprint of the first edition. *Strauss* aspires, in the preface of his new work, after the honor of having written such a life of Jesus for the German people as *Renan* has for the French, but according to all appearance the palm is more likely to fall to Schenkel, though even he will fall far short of the mark. But we must not take up more space in showing why the work is notable, but proceed *ad rem*. The book is divided into seven sections. The first is introductory, and discusses in two chapters "The Significance of the Person of Christ and the Treatises thereon hitherto," 36 pages. The second section (pp. 36-93) is entitled "The Development;" the third (pp. 93-122) "The First Establishment of a Society;" the fourth (pp. 122-171) "The Messiah;" the fifth (pp. 171-220) "The Field of Operation in Judea;" the sixth (pp. 220-263) "The Crisis;" the seventh (pp. 263-405) "The Consummation;" in all twenty-nine chapters, with an appendix of notes. The author claims that it is the first delineation of Christ's character and deeds on the basis of the second Gospel.

The fourth he rejects from beginning to end, though his opinion of its authorship does not agree with that of the Tübingen critics. Matthew's Gospel he holds to be an outright forgery, and Luke's full of legendary matter. Even Mark's is not wholly free from such elements, inasmuch as *our* Mark is a tinkered-up recension of the original work. Still, as the purest source left to us, we must follow it in preference to all others, and by means of historical criticism, etc., endeavor to elaborate the real facts. He denies the supernatural origin of his hero, but thinks there may be some basis of fact for the account of the disputation with the doctors in the temple. He grants the reality of the wonderful cures, but they were wrought by the natural powers of his "hallowed personality." The real miracles attributed to him, such as the stilling of the storm, feeding the multitude, etc., are products of the excited imagination of the people after his mysterious departure from mortal view. They are "dark shadows" cast upon his fair character by ignorant and infatuated followers. His view of the sources leaves of course ample room for free eclecticism in gleaning up the elements for his "Character-Portraiture," a liberty in which he has indulged to the fullest extent; for example, we are oracularly told that the only authentic word from the cross which we have is, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Why? Because it is all that Mark reports. But when Mark, this exclusively infallible authority, narrates in his eighth chapter the feeding of the multitude, O! that is *mythical* all of a sudden! If Mark had recorded the history of the Annunciation, or of the Lord's *post mortem* apparition to St. Paul, it would have caused our facile doctor no difficulty at all. Such accounts are *of course* mythical. Mark *does* record the Resurrection, but it "is infallibly a later patchwork addition," etc. A very convenient mode of writing history this! From a pretty thorough comparison of this precious production with the new work of Strauss, we are compelled to say, that for arbitrary dogmatical assumption, hopeless prepossession, and cool Iscariotism, this prelate of the Baden "Evangelical Church," this educator of future ministers of our Lord Jesus Christ, quite outstrips his openly infidel compeer. And yet he talks so touchingly about "*our Redeemer*," and gives over the powerlessness of "the Church" with the masses, and writes this book *to counteract the awful effects of Renan's!* Associated with hundreds of "like precious faith" in the "*German Protestant Verein*," he is laboring for a revival of religion throughout the fatherland, to be brought about by abolishing consistorial governments and introducing the presbyterian form, only completely democratized. The theology he is intending to introduce into the new "Folks-Church" can be inferred from these hints of his Christology.

Biblischer Commentar über das Alte Testament Herausgegeben von CARL FRIEDR. KEIL und FRANZ DELITZSCH. IV. Theil. *Poetische Bücher*. II. Band. *Das Buch Job*. Leipzig : 1864.

Professors Keil and Delitzsch have undertaken the difficult but exceedingly important task of furnishing us with a continuous commentary on the Old Testament, abreast with the latest results of philological, historical, geographical, and dogmatical investigation, and from the standpoint of Biblical orthodoxy. The present volume, embracing the Book of Job, is the fourth of the series in the order of publication; the first embracing Genesis and Exodus; the second, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy; the third, Joshua, Judges, and Ruth. These three are from the pen of Dr. Keil, as also a fourth covering the books of Samuel and Kings, now in press. The volume before us on Job is by Dr. Delitzsch, and is soon to be followed by one on Isaiah, also by him. The parts thus far issued have been very favorably received, and in view of the present interest in Old Testament researches both in England and America, will doubtless have large foreign sales.

Restricting our present remarks to the volume before us, we have first to say that it is a closely printed octavo of 543 pages, costing two thaler twenty-four neugroschen. In an appendix Consul Doctor Wetzstein gives us a very interesting Dissertation on "the Monastery of Job in Hauran, and the Job-Legend," illustrated by a map of his tour of exploration, inscriptions, etc. It contains not a little rare, and not a little new information, admirably adapted to throw light on the sacred book. Dr. Delitzsch is too well known through his "Biblical Psychology," "Commentary on Genesis," and other works, to need special characterization. His standpoint is that of reprinted Lutheranism, though he is more independent of the stiff scholastic form of the elder Lutheran orthodoxy than some of the party with which he is associated. The authorship of the book of Job he attributes to one of the sages who surrounded the court of Solomon, making his era, in the words of Professor Barnewell, "brighter than the Elizabethan and nobler than the Augustan." On this point he has the support of such authorities as Hävernicks, Vaihinger, Hahn, Schlottmann, Oehler, Keil, and Hoffmann, the last of whom has changed his mind since publishing his work entitled "Prophecy and Fulfillment." In that he advocated the theory of its composition in the Mosaic age. The statement of the problem of the book, and of the answer given thereto, is admirable. Among other erroneous fancies, that some time ago started by Renan, (1859,) that the object of the poem was to refute and do away with the old Mosaic doctrine of temporal retribution, is emphatically repudiated. Dr. Delitzsch shows that what M. Renan understands to be the old Mosaic doctrine of retribution (that

is, as perfectly administered in this life, so that all suffering presupposes guilt) was no part either of patriarchal or of Mosaic theology. The text is reproduced in a new translation, the historical parts in prose, the body of the book in poetic strophes. His version and explanation of the famous utterance of Job, "I know that my Redeemer liveth," etc., differs but slightly from that given by Dr. Taylor Lewis in these pages, July, 1863. Some crudities and groundless fancies have found their way into the book, but as a whole it is an admirable production, useful alike to the practical preacher and professional theologian.

◆◆◆

Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.

Annual of Scientific Discovery; or, Year-book of Facts in Science and Art for 1864. Exhibiting the most Important Discoveries and Improvements in Mechanics, Useful Arts, Natural Philosophy, Chemistry, Astronomy, Geology, Zoology, Botany, Mineralogy, Meteorology, Geography, Antiquities, etc. Edited by DAVID A. WELLS, A.M., M.D. 12mo., pp. 351. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1864.

Mr. Wells, the faithful chronicler of the progress of Science, makes a very welcome annual visit to our table. This year, as last, he reports largely of improvements in the science of human destruction. There seems to be little advance in the search for the "fossil man." Neither the doctrine of Darwinian development or of the pre-adamite man has received any such demonstration as to remove it from the category of mere opinion to that of accomplished science.

We give a few items from this volume.

The following paragraph dissipates a favorite idea in regard to bee instinct:

In the *Annals of Natural History*, (London,) 1863, will be found an analysis of the mathematics of the bee-hive, by Rev. S. Houghton, in which the theory of the bee's forming hexagonal cells is completely overthrown. Lord Brougham, in his treatise *Dialogues on Instinct*, remarks: "There is no bee in the world that ever made cylindrical cells;" and the fact of the existence of hexagonal cells in the honeycomb is generally quoted as a wonderful example of instinctive combination of means to ends in a low form of animal existence. Mr. Houghton, however, shows that the bee makes only cylindrical cells, and that the hexagonal and rhomboidal cells are alike the result of pressure, and represent the angles of equilibrium between the pressure and the resistance, just as the orbits of the planets are the midway lines between centrifugal and centripetal forces; the bee is not, therefore, such a mathematician as has been generally supposed. The alleged economy of material resulting from the bee's method of working is also shown to be fallacious. Several mathematicians have carefully investigated the relation of expenditure of material to the mathematical requirements of connected cells of given dimensions and of a form adapted to the uses to which they are to be put. L'Hullier, in 1781, arrived at the conclusion that the economy of wax referred to the total expenditure is $\frac{1}{11}$ st, so that the bees can make fifty-one cells instead of fifty by the adoption of the rhombic dodecahedron. He also showed that mathematicians can make cells of the same form as those of the bees, which, instead of using only a *minimum* of wax, would use the *minimum minimorum*, so that five cells could

be made of less wax than that which now makes only four, instead of fifty-one out of fifty. The humble-bee, moreover, in the construction of its cells, uses proportionably more than three times the amount of material that is used by the hive-bee.—P. 158.

The so-called Spiritual Phenomena.—A recognition of the reality of many of the phenomena—physical or physiological—which are popularly classified under the term "*Spiritual*" appears to be gradually gaining ground among the scientific men of the United States and Europe. Among the names of note who are reported during the past year as having extended such a recognition we find that of Professor De Morgan, who is confessedly one of the most distinguished of living British physicists and mathematicians.—P. xi.

One striking fact in the perusal of this and every other scientific book at the present day is the number of new words coined by the "physicists" and "scientists" generally to suit their purpose. Whole vocabularies spring up every season. Common sense both justifies and requires this; and we think our men of science are right in treating with quiet silence the pedantic purist who should exclaim, "That is a barbarism; it is not in Webster's Dictionary!" The simple question is, is it a precise, self-defining term for an object or thought which has no existing name in the language? If not, then it is an abortion and a nuisance, and should be abated. If it be, it is, like every other needed invention, a benefit to the world.

At page 285 a writer thus argues against the doctrine of man's creation: "When a mammal was created, did the oxygen, hydrogen, nitrogen, and carbon of the air, and the lime, soda, phosphorus, potash, water, etc., from the earth, come together, and on the instant combine into a completely formed horse, lion, elephant, or other animal? If this question is answered in the affirmative, it will be easily seen that the answer is entirely opposed by the observed analogies of nature." We should answer that science has nothing whatever to say about a creation, and so nothing against it. Science was not upon the spot to observe how it was done; nor was she upon the spot to say how it was not done. If done by a known and experienced supernatural intervention she cannot know it, for she limits herself to the level of secondary causes and cannot look upward or Godward. But other and higher knowledges are not bound to limit themselves to this low ground. We presume that our reader who has not thought upon the subject will indeed feel a difficulty in picturing, or imagining to himself these various elements of a man concentrating into a human body. But that same reader would find it equally difficult to conceive the following process of actual nature, quoted by Mr. Wells from the *Westminster Review*:

The student of nature wonders the more, and is astonished the less, the more conversant he becomes with her operations; but of all the perennial miracles she offers to his inspection, perhaps the most worthy of admiration is the development of a plant or an animal from its embryo. Examine the recently laid egg of some

animal, such as a salamander or a newt. It is a minute spheroid in which the best microscope will reveal nothing but a structureless sac, inclosing a glairy fluid, holding granules in suspension. But strange possibilities lie dormant in that semi-fluid globule. Let a moderate supply of warmth reach its watery cradle, and the plastic matter undergoes changes so steady and purpose-like in their succession, that one can only compare them to those operated by a skillful modeler upon a formless lump of clay. As with an invisible trowel, the mass is divided and subdivided into smaller and smaller portions until it is reduced to an aggregation of granules not too large to build withal the finest fabrics of the nascent organism. And, then, it is as if a delicate finger traced out the line to be occupied by the spinal column, and moulded the contour of the body; pinching up the head at one end, the tail at the other, and fashioning flank and limb into due salamandrine proportions, in so artistic a way that, after watching the process hour by hour, one is almost involuntarily possessed by the notion that some more subtle aid to vision than an achromatic glass would show the hidden artist, with his plan before him, striving with skillful manipulation to perfect his work.

As life advances, and the young amphibian ranges the waters, the terror of his insect cotemporaries, not only are nutritious particles supplied by its prey, by the addition of which to its frame growth takes place, laid down, each in its proper spot, and in such due proportion to the rest, as to reproduce the form, the color, and the size characteristic of the parental stock; but even the wonderful powers of reproducing lost parts possessed by these animals are controlled by the same governing tendency. Cut off the legs, the tail, the jaws—separately or all together—and, as Spallanzan showed long ago, these parts not only grow again, but the redintegrated limb is formed on the same type as those which were lost. The new jaw or leg is a newt's, and never by any accident more like that of a frog.—P. 258.

Jehovah-God we are told in the Record made *man in his own image*. Repeatedly are we told also, that Jehovah appeared to patriarchs and other ancients *in a human form*. Did that same Jehovah at the first assume that form, and then bid the protoplast take shape and appear like a mirrored image before him and in his own likeness?

As pertinent to this objector's difficulty, we take the following remarks from the Third Article in the last *London Review*:

What right, again, have we to lay it down as certain that such-and such results must have taken so long to bring about? *If you intensify the force*, the simplest formula in mechanics will tell you that you may diminish the time. We never could see why, because results are slowly produced now, they must always have gone on at the same rate. But all this is beside the grand question which we are led to believe underlies all this talk about development and mutability of species; the question is, "Is man a higher development of the anthropoid ape?" On this point it is enough to say that, whatever may be proved by and by as to transmutation of species, whatever structural affinity between man and certain quadrumana may have been or may hereafter be established, nothing of this kind touches the question. Man is man not so much by virtue of his structure as because of his distinct *functions*: his throat may be anatomically all but the same as that of the orang, but *he can speak with his throat*; he alone has "the breath of life whereby he is a living soul."—P. 63.

We had marked a number of passages in Mr. Wells's *Annual* which limited space forbids us to use.

History, Biography, and Topography.

Specimen Pages of the American Conflict: A History of the Great Rebellion in the United States of America, 1860-1864; Its Causes, Incidents, and Results. Intended to exhibit especially its Moral and Political

Phases with the Drift and Progress of American Opinion respecting Human Slavery from 1776 to 1864. By HORACE GREELEY. Illustrated by Portraits on steel of Generals, Statesmen, and other Eminent Men; Views of Important Places, Battle Scenes, and Diagrams from Official Sources, etc. Hartford: O. D. Case & Co. Chicago: George Sherwood & Co. 1864.

The title-page is so full and descriptive as to be a book notice in itself. Mr. Greeley undertakes to be the historian of the second and greater American Revolution through which we are now so anxiously passing. No man living is perhaps more competent for the task. Few cotemporaries have so clearly comprehended the significance of its events at every stage. True final history is indeed made up of great after thought; but it is the cotemporary who furnishes the material; and, perhaps, there is no man among us whose opinions and statements are more the type of what after history will say.

He did not enter early into the antislavery battle. And we speak here all the more boldly because Mr. Greeley's preliminary review both of the influence of early Christianity upon slavery and of the position of the Christian Church at the present day is eminently defective. New England Methodism had discussed and had become nearly unanimous before he had, even in his public action, touched the topic. The Methodist Church had been seivered by the question before Mr. Greeley woke to its existence. It is true that such was the influence of Mr. Greeley's associates, the old Whig party of our Atlantic cities, and especially of our metropolitan New York, that even after we had let the southern section go, we were ruled and hamstrung by border pro-slaveryism. From that same influence exerted ever since over his daily organ by our conservative laity even in the Republican ranks, (a large share of our religious conservatives were political Republicans,) the antislavery ministry of our Church have fought the battle in our Church with no aid or sympathy from the *New York Tribune*.

But since the time that Mr. Greeley entered the contest in which he was so long preceded by whole sections of Methodism, he has evinced the courage, tirelessness, and sagacity of a great leader. And with the exception of its religious phases—for doing justice to which he has not the heart and therefore no other qualification—the same sagacity which rendered him so generally master of the field of discussion, renders him a master of its history. And those high humanitarian views which he has taken of all the secular parts of the subject will be the views that posterity will take, and the verdict of mankind will forever affirm.

We need not say that the work will be written in that clear, full, earnest, powerful style of vernacular English and natural common

sense in which Mr. Greeley so excels, in which William Cobbett was his type, but not his equal. The "Specimens" are done in a handsome style of typographic art, on a clean ground of snow-white paper, with engravings, not indeed masterpieces of art, but which, in this day of scragged caricatures, are, on the whole, acceptable likenesses. We herein expect a history well worth general acceptance, accurate in its details of fact, authoritative in its expressions of opinion, a standard both for present reference and for future historical writers.

A Youth's History of the Rebellion, from the Bombardment of Fort Sumter to the Capture of Roanoke Island. By WILLIAM M. THAYER. 24mo., pp. 347. Boston: Walker, Wise, & Co.

The history of the rebellion is here given in free colloquial style, under guise of family conversation. Care has been duly taken of historical accuracy, and the spirit of freedom and patriotism inspires the narrative. Such books should supplant the fictions with which our youths are so much drugged.

♦ ♦ ♦

Politics, Law, and General Morals.

The Social Condition of the People of England. By JOSEPH KAY, Esq., M.A., of Trinity College, Cambridge. 12mo., pp. 323. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1863.

England is now in the grasp of a landholding oligarchy, just as a slaveholding oligarchy has brought us to the brink of ruin. Probably about three thousand families control the English government. A few thousand landlords hold the soil. Five men, it is said, own one fourth of all Scotland. This terrible monopoly is increasing rather than diminishing in absoluteness.

The result is that the small freeholder is an extinct species, and the landless lack room. Earth and space are too costly for the dowerless occupant. Families are crowded in the least possible limits, and a contact of persons ensues which banishes shame, and often reduces the whole to a sweltering mass of debauchery and brutality. Thirty pages of Mr. Kay's book unfolding this state of things are absolutely but necessarily too indecent to be read aloud, or to be copied into our pages. When it is understood that so degraded have entire counties and sections of England become that it violates no current sense of propriety for a father to swear, in open court, that he *witnessed* the debauchery by which his daughter became the mother of a bastard, we must realize that modern Protestant England must forestall revolution by reform or revolution will be more desirable than the ruin that must ensue. Neither God nor man can endure the nuisance of such a Sodom on earth.

The advocates of slavery in this country used to point to the

terrible condition of the English poor as a reason why antislavery England should be silent in regard to the great American crime. It was a pitiful attempt at retort. It is not antislavery England, but pro-slavery England, the England that pets the slaveholders' rebellion, and lets loose Alabamas upon the commerce of our free states, that supports this system. It is not philanthropic England, but the pro-slavery and pirate England, upon which rests the guilt. And pirate England never sincerely rebuked slavery. The true rebukers of slavery in England are the rebukers also of this crushing landlordism. The common friends of humanity in both countries are one, condemning wrong, oppression, demoralization, in every form and in every land. Nor must it be forgotten that this demoralization has not been the aim and object of a direct legislation. The English statute books are not blackened with any laws like the American slave code, forbidding instruction and purposely aiming at brutalizing her English poor. This degradation is the indirect and undesired result of a system selfish indeed, but not, like our slave system, intentionally diabolical.

Our laws of inheritance, dividing estates, and our extensive domains, counteract the tendencies to great land monopoly. Did Europe pour no hordes of pauperism into our country we should, beyond all doubt, be the purest population that history has yet revealed. Our mobs are foreign. Europe, and especially England, pours upon us the mob material and then reproaches us for being mobocratic. What we do is to accept her wretched population, raise them to citizenship, educate them into humanity, and during the process bear the reproaches which the oppressors, who have made them mob, so magnanimously heap upon us for their mobishness. The English papers talk scornfully of "the New York mob;" but that "New York mob" is a British mob. Give us time, that is, a generation or two, to-Americanize, that is, to educate and assimilate it, and it will be a healthful, noble part of our social system. When it ceases to be British it ceases to be mob. We gave the world the temperance reform because we had the European mob to elevate. Had we none but our own home-born Protestant, free school, and evangelical Church population, we should either have needed no temperance reform, or the temperance reform would have been a perfect success.

Mr. Kay's book is both a reproach and an honor to England. A reproach for the state of things it exposes, an honor for the spirit and the men who expose and aim to reform it. May they succeed in their godlike work, and render England a thousand times purer, greater, and more prosperous than she is!

The stupendous neglect of the education of the masses by the English Church has allowed them to sink below all sympathy with her church forms and services. "A Romanist service, or a Ranter's service, will attract crowds of poor, where the service of the English Church, or of the Independents, or of the Methodists, or of the Baptists will not attract fifty. But it will be said that the Presbyterian churches of Scotland are filled, although the service is even less imaginative than that of the English Church. It is so because the Scotch poor are much better educated, and much more intelligent than our poor; because the Presbyterian clergymen are not nearly so far separated from the poor in their social origin, habits, and education as our clergy, and because they visit their people in their cottages very much more than our English clergy can do." There is, too, a loss of all sympathy between the masses and clergy arising from the uniformly over-refinement of the clerical character. The church clergyman is a university-bred gentleman, and the effluvium in the filthy tenements of the poor is repulsive to his senses.

It is a common remark of the operatives of Lancashire, and one which is only too true, "Your Church is a Church for the rich, but not for the poor. It was not intended for such people as we are."

The Roman Church is much wiser than the English in this respect. It selects a great part of its priests from the poorest classes of society, and educates them gratuitously in great simplicity of habits. The consequence is, that they feel no difficulty in mingling with the poor. Many of them are not men of refined habits themselves, and are not therefore disgusted at want of refinement in others. They understand perfectly what are the thoughts, feelings, and habits of the poor. They know how to suit their demeanor, conversation, teaching, and actions so as to make the poor quite at ease with them. They do not feel the disgust which a more refined man cannot help feeling, in being obliged to enter the low haunts of the back streets and alleys.

It is singular to observe how the priests of Romanist countries abroad associate with the poor. I have often seen them riding with the peasants in their carts along the roads, eating with them in their houses, sitting with them in the village inns, mingling with them in their village festivals, and yet always preserving their authority. Besides this, the spectacles of the Romanist worship are more attractive to the less educated masses than the less imaginative forms of Protestant worship, and the services of the Roman Church are shorter and much more numerous than those of the English. These causes fill the Romanist churches, both abroad and in our manufacturing districts, on the Sundays, and at the early matins of the weekdays, with crowds of poor, who go there to receive the blessing of their priests, to hear prayers put up, which they believe to be for blessings, although they do not understand them, and to see the glittering spectacles of the Romanist worship exhibited before them.

There are significant facts before us if we would but see them. Within the last few years splendid Romanist Churches, full of free sittings, have been springing up in all the crowded districts of England, and especially in the manufacturing towns of the north. In Manchester alone, three beautiful Romanist churches, and one magnificent Romanist Cathedral—now by far the finest building in the town—have been erected within the last twelve years. The priests seem to be able to obtain as much money as they require, and to spare no pains to attract the people. Their exertions among the poorest of the operatives, and in the lowest of their haunts, are praiseworthy in the extreme. They know that it is infinitely more important to have priests than churches. When they build a

church, therefore, they generally attach to it, not one, but several, and often many priests, some of them chosen from the lowest classes of the community, and educated expressly for their labors. In the manufacturing districts of England, a large handsome building, of the same style of architecture as the church, and capable of serving as the dwelling house of ten or twelve priests, is generally attached to each of the churches.—P. 69.

Here are some very important considerations for us as American Methodists. We need the rich and the refined and the learned, but not at the price of abandoning the poor and the uneducated. We want a ministry equal to the best in the Universal Church in erudition and pulpit talent and intellect; and we want a ministry that can go into the hamlet, hut, and the lowest cellar without overawing its tenants with its respectability. How can these two be obtained and continued? How can each class and each man be induced to move contentedly, spontaneously, and eagerly in his own sphere, unimpeded by jealousy against *caste*? Romanism can do it. Why not Methodism?

Speeches, Lectures, and Letters. By WENDELL PHILLIPS. 12mo., pp. 562. Boston: Walker, Wise, & Co. 1864.

Mr. Phillips's speeches might, for several reasons, well be entitled *Philippics*. The original Philippic was indeed so titled from its object; these as well from their author. But from their subject and substance no ancient oratory was ever more brilliant with keen sarcasm, splendid invective, or destructive satire, scattered like diamond handfals in every direction. Walker & Wise have here enshrined them in a classic exterior; rightly, for they are classic, as products of rare genius, aristocratic culture, stern moral purpose, historic permanence.

Mr. Phillips's "first appearance on the stage" was unintentionally somewhat scenic. The murder of Lovejoy had just startled the public mind. The gun of Sumter did not more unequivocally inaugurate the rebellion than the gun of Alton proclaimed the enthronization of the slave-king over the entire North amid enforced silence and abolished freedom. The words of James T. Austin, comparing this deed of mob despotism to the Boston tea-party of the Revolution, aroused the spirit of young Wendell Phillips, and called a mightier Lovejoy to the battle of truth and freedom. Very appropriately, that first impulsive utterance stands as first in this collection. It was a noble introductory to a series of the most manly utterances of the age.

We had read many of Mr. Phillips's speeches before we had heard one. The fiery style of the printed text seemed, upon listening to his voice, in unexpected contrast with the deliberate coolness of his manner. The lava poured forth without seeming at all to heat the

machinery that poured it. It seemed to be carefully measured out in well-calculated bucketsful. There seems to be a very calm, intellectual, aristocratic Phillips behind the fierce, fiery, radical Phillips; and the back Phillips seems to have made up his mind that it mattered little what the front Phillips had to meet, whether hisses, obsolete eggs, or democratic rows; he—the back Phillips—was securely undisturbed and no way implicated in the concern. This indicates the naturally endowed agitator. He purposes and prepares his whole system of pyrotechnics upon principle. Was he not a man of high moral principle, had he not taken right and truth and perfection as his ultimate aim, he could in turbulent times be “lord of misrule.”

Though Mr. Phillips deals master truths at the delinquent part of the Church and clergy, we find no proof of his working in behalf of irreligion. He makes not antislaveryism a vantage ground against orthodoxy. He shows none of the rancorous polemic mendacity of Theodore Parker. Here as elsewhere his castigations are well measured and truthfully adjusted. His anger, if his polished invectives really ever indicate anything designated by that term, is sequent upon offense against his righteous cause; never is the righteous cause made the pretext of subsidiary purposes. We believe that he sees men at the present day very much as they will stand in the light of future history.

His lecture on Toussaint L'Overture—the jet black hero and statesman of St. Domingo—shows that he deals not in invective because he is not as perfect a master of eulogy. That piece should be read as an illustration in what audacity of lying pro-slaveryism has indulged, what persistence in refusing to hear truth servility has practiced. “The massacre of St. Domingo!” has been a phrase of mystery suggesting the unknown horrors, forsooth, in which emancipation must ever result! Yet the truth of history, when clearly made known, shows the bloody treachery of despotism, the magnanimity of the slave, and the unsurpassed greatness of one illustrious negro.

We commend this book to the perusal of all, but especially of our young men. It is throughout a noble lesson. We admire not the character of the professional agitator. Ultraisms and radicalism in themselves are inconveniences and so evils. The presumption is rightly and truly against them. But they are not necessarily moral evils, and they may be by greater evils transformed to good. The true highest test is Right; the secondary test is an ultimate Good. In this sordid age nothing is more important than that men should learn to separate the element of justice and the true good from those conventional interests that blind and pervert the eye of the soul.

Miscellaneous.

A Treatise on Homiletics: Designed to Illustrate the Theory and Practice of Preaching the Gospel. By DANIEL P. KIDDER, D.D., Professor in the Garrett Biblical Institute. 12mo., pp. 494. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1864.

This work of Dr. Kidder's is by far the best manual for the young minister that we have examined, and is specially adapted for the ministry of our own Church. Of the entire literature of the subject he shows himself eminently a master; he has adduced from every source an immense variety of suggestions, enriched by his own additions, modified by a wise common sense, and expressed in a perfectly lucid style. We trust it will be studied by our junior ministry in general, and that it will take its place in our course of text-books. More we should add, but we expect the work to be the subject of an article in our Quarterly.

The National Almanac and Annual Record for the Year 1864. 12mo., pp. 641. Philadelphia: George W. Childs.

Mr. Childs's National Almanac is a masterpiece of condensation. Of the United States, it furnishes the details of persons and matters in the various departments of State, War, Navy, and Treasury. Of the individual states, the details political, judicial, financial, military, and literary. Statistics are furnished of the religious denominations of the world. A chronological record is made of the events of the year. The hundred concluding pages are devoted to a compressed summary of the affairs of foreign nations. The work is unsurpassed as a standard of reference.

Pamphlets.

The Compendium of Tachygraphy; or, Lindsley's Phonetic Short-hand, Explaining and Illustrating the Common Style of the Art. By D. P. LINDSLEY, Teacher of Phonetic Short-hand in Bryant, Stratton, & Co.'s Commercial College, Hartford, Conn. 12mo., pp. 32. Hartford, Conn.: Brown & Gross. 1864.

This is an exhibit of a new short-hand, intended to supplant Pitman's Phonography, which the author considers a failure. In what respect it is any less defective or any more perfect we are unable to see. Its main difference in principle consists in bringing the vowels into the body of the word, instead of leaving them as supplementary and optional points. This seems to us the reverse of an improvement. In all our use of phonography we have considered it a great advantage that we could write consonants alone in the first draught and then supply vowels as we read what we had written. And by a competent supplement of vowels we can render it as unequivocal as chirography can be. This supplied a limitation decisive in itself with-

out obliging a perpetual indecision and choice whether or not to insert the vowel while writing the body of the word.

We see not the slightest ground for the assumption that phonography is a failure. We have found no difficulty in corresponding with our phonographic brethren; and were our correspondents, composers, proof-readers, and friends all phonographers, we should use nothing else. And indeed were every phonographer thus enabled to use phonography always and alone in all his writing, it would in all cases be successful. All the difficulties encounter Mr. Lindsley's system that encounter Pitman's. If phonography cannot succeed, no other system of short-hand can; for both in theory and in practice we esteem it geometrically an ultimate. We therefore feel it a duty to express a friendly regret that any attempt like Mr. Lindsley's should be made, and our advice that nobody imagine it to be comparable to Pitman's.

Lay Representation in the Methodist Episcopal Church: its Justice and Expediency. By GILBERT HAVEN. 12mo., pp. 46. Boston: J. P. Magee. 1864.

Mr. Haven's pamphlet is a spicy and vigorous production. In the matter of "justice," it maintains the *right* of the laity to a share in religious and ecclesiastical administration from both the Old Testament and the New. The argument is, to say the least, quite as good as the scripture proof by the venerable fathers, Bond, Bangs, and Barnes, excluding the laity from all such right. Few of us at the present day doubt that *right*. And yet we are gratified to see that in face of the fact that our ministry sacrifice so many rights, our lay brethren have not latterly argued the matter on the ground of *rights*, but of "*the best good of the Church*." We doubt not they are great gainers by this method of putting the case. We recommend the pamphlet before us to the attention of both ministry and laity.

The action of the late General Conference on the subject meets, we believe, the hearty concurrence of all concerned. Its own further action was estopped by the late vote; but the subject is now placed by its direct authority before our attention as a matter of Church-wide consideration and discussion. The columns of our church papers will doubtless be opened to a free and generous debate. So also are the pages of our Quarterly.

The following books arrived too late for notice in the present number: Spring's Pulpit Ministrations, 2 vols., 8vo., Harpers. Merivale's Roman History, Vol. IV, Appleton & Co. Hazard on the Will, Appleton & Co. Harpers' Pictorial History of the Great Rebellion, No. 7. Bethune's Lectures on the Catechism, Sheldon & Co. Light in Darkness, Gould & Lincoln. The Memorial Hour, Gould & Lincoln. Dr. Wayland's Memoir of Chalmers, Gould & Lincoln. Letters of Mendelssohn, from Leyboldt, Phil.